University of Windsor
Scholarship at UWindsor

Major Papers | Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1991

Separate and Different Education: A History of Women at the University of Windsor, 1920 to the Present

Mona L. Gleason
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers

 Part of the Canadian History Commons

Recommended Citation

Gleason, Mona L., "Separate and Different Education: A History of Women at the University of Windsor, 1920 to the Present" (1991). *Major Papers*. 4.
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers/4

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in Major Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

A "SEPARATE AND 'DIFFERENT' EDUCATION :" A HISTORY OF WOMEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, 1920 TO THE PRESENT

BY

MONA L. GLEASON

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
1991

A "SEPARATE AND `DIFFERENT' EDUCATION:" A HISTORY OF WOMEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, 1920 TO THE PRESENT

by

Mona L. Gleason

A Major Paper
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
through the Department of History in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1991

PCB 7846

@ Copyright by Mona Gleason, 1991

APPROVED BY:

Kenneth G. Pryke, Director

Jacqueline Murray

Bruce Tucker

Table of Contents

Introduction

Although the experience of women in higher education has traditionally occupied a limited space in Canadian historiography, recent work by feminist and women's historians has uncovered a rich and complex field. The field is a relatively new one, less mature than in the United States and Britain, nevertheless historians are beginning to suggest new approaches to the history of women in Canadian universities. [1] Scholars have produced several institutional studies which analyze the historical experience of women at particular universities and which establish the groundwork for modifying our understanding the history of women in higher education in Canada. [2]

The experience of women at the University of Windsor has both paralleled and diverged from that at other Canadian institutions. The present study, while contributing to the existing historiography, seeks to add to our understanding of the constructs of gender and how they operate in a patriarchal institution and in society. [3] While considerations of class and ethnicity have significance for women, constants based on gender define their experience to a much greater extent. Regardless of social rank or historical period, the mere fact of being born female defines women's experience as separate and different from that of men. [4] At the University of Windsor, as in the rest of Canadian society, assumptions about gender influenced women's

assigned roles, the roles they have chosen, the academic opportunities afforded to them and the nature of their experience. Often these assumptions caused a gap between the ideological approaches to women and the reality of women's lives. While the sources of women's explicit and implicit "separateness" varied, the end result remained essentially the same: women and men experienced academic life differently. [5]

When the discussion of women does make its way into a limited number of traditional university histories, the account is brief, descriptive and essentially void of interpretation and analysis. [6] In their discussions, historians have emphasized "women's fight for admission to the universities and their life on newly coeducational campuses." [7] Alison Prentice, in a recent article on the historiography of women and education, comments unfavourably on this cursory treatment and concludes that "beyond the initial admission of women to university, little research on the higher education of Canadian women has been done". [8]

The absence of women's history in the literature has, in part, been a function of the limited conceptualization of the history of higher education in Canada. Only recently have studies dedicated to the history of the Canadian university moved beyond essentially event-centred accounts of fledgling institutions struggling for establishment and survival. [9] This approach lacks an interpretive framework which takes into account such factors as the social and intellectual context surrounding the

university's development. New studies dedicated to the history of higher education in Canada place their interpretation in larger contexts, perceiving the university as both a reflector and an instigator of social change.

The study of women's position within the history of higher education in Canada, often excluded from traditional histories, grew out of this new approach. The production of a number of Status of Women reports, undertaken at various Canadian universities during the 1970's, sensitized scholars to the unsatisfactory position of women and produced a heightened awareness of their experience.[10] The reports did not employ an historical perspective but rather concentrated on the current level and characteristics of women's involvement. At approximately the same time, British and American scholars, having moved beyond static glimpses of women and higher education, were producing integrated and historical accounts.[11] A small number of Canadian scholars, recognizing the significance of this development in other countries, called for a similar approach to women and the university in Canada. In 1975, for example, Margaret Gillett reminded scholars that the complex issues surrounding women in higher education did not operate in a vacuum in the past and that "part of the problem has to lie with society as a whole, with the stereotypical thinking, the role ascriptions".[12] Gillett pointed out that the narrow approach to the university taken by traditional historians not only failed to include a larger context but also excluded a full

understanding of the nature of women's experience. Appealing directly to historians of education, Gillett instructed scholars to "inject the women's issue into the mainstream of the history of school reform" and to "assume that women have made contributions to education". [13] Gillett's call for a rethinking of the history of higher education includes the introduction of gender issues into discussions of women's experience in the university setting. In so doing, the author pointed out, our understanding of the history of higher education would be significantly expanded.

The most significant contributions to the understanding of women's experience in the university in Canada currently take the form of institutional or case studies. [14] In these works, the roles women have been assigned and have chosen, the societal and institutional factors that have determined this role and their experiences are examined over time at specific universities. The historical examination of a specific university offers some degree of analysis, interpretation and explanation of the nature of women's experience, and provides a corrective to traditional histories which made no such attempt to distinguish women's experience from that of men. Through the employment of gender as a historical category of analysis, these works are able to delineate the unique nature and characteristics of women's education at the university level.

Based on the assumption that women and men did experience university life differently in the past, the new histories ask

different questions about the very nature of higher education. For example, more recent scholarship has focused on the meaning of "coeducation" for women and men. Did role ascriptions based on gender determine their choice of academic disciplines, their level of involvement in student organizations and politics and the nature of attitudes expressed towards their presence ? Did both women and men enjoy equal access to positions of power within the university structure ? Did the university represent a "liberating" environment in which women themselves exercised self-determination or did the very nature of the institution circumvent such power ?

Such questions have led to a significant body of knowledge about women's experience in universities in Canada and around the world. The debate over women's admission to the university, for example, has occupied a significant place in historical studies devoted to women and higher education. These studies have uncovered the extensive and rigorous debate, intimately dependent upon prevailing definitions of women's proper sphere, that was waged in both religious and secular circles. In the secular world, and in medical arguments in particular, the notion of higher education for women centred on their physical capacity for learning. As a social institution, medicine followed and reinforced other social institutions and reflected ideology as much as biology. [15] The most widely known exponent of the medical argument against higher education for women in the late nineteenth century in America was articulated by Dr. Edward Clark

of the Harvard Medical School. [16] In Sex in Education (1877), Clark argued that those women who pursued their education past puberty risked serious damage to their reproductive systems. The energy devoted to the learning process, Clark concluded, would thus be diverted from their ovarian development. [17] Clark's emphasis on the negative impact of higher education on women's reproductive ability was based on assumptions about women's role in nineteenth - century American culture. Women's assigned role was as wife and mother, and thus her essential importance rested on the ability to procreate. [18] Clark reasoned that the pursuit of a higher education could jeopardize women's ability to perform this role and was thus undesirable.

Religious arguments against the higher education of women bolstered those waged in medical circles. Ministers argued that the "existence of divinely ordained differences between men and women" precluded women from entering the academic and public world of men. Women were to fulfil a "separate, complementary role to that of men". Religious arguments, when used to support women's higher education, stipulated that the experience would better prepare them for their "pre-ordained" role as wife and mother. [19]

The characteristics and sources of women's "separateness" on campus has concerned historians in more recent years. Studies of the experience of women at the University of British Columbia and Queen's University both found that although each institution was co-educational, "in many ways, women experienced a segregated

life apart on campus".[20] This notion of woman as "other" also influenced the nature of their education at the University of Windsor. Although women were invited to come onto campus in 1934, they were educated and housed separately from men. Even after the advent of coeducation in 1950, women and men did not experience university life identically. They entered different faculties, shared unequally in positions of power and authority and garnered different responses from the administration. The production of disparities between the academic experience of women and men thus resulted from the perceived appropriateness of this "separateness". The assumption that women and men went to university to equip themselves for different societal roles informed their career choices and goals in university. The societal role most appropriate for women at this time was as care-giver of the family. While this duty did not preclude other work, women had to find employment that they was trained for and that was compatible with their primary responsibility to the family. Women were to be competent wives and mothers and were, and still are, found largely in the "service" or "nurturing" professions. Teaching, domestic science, nursing and social work, represented "extensions of women's traditional domestic sphere" and were specifically geared towards her.[21] By contrast, engineering was thought to be an exclusively male undertaking.[22]

With the advent of the contemporary women's movement in the late 1960's, women began to reject the appropriateness of

differences in the experience of men and women based on gender in all aspects of society. Contemporary studies of women's status at Canadian universities indicate that women on campus have become politically active and aware of the presence of sexism. The entrance of women into non-traditional disciplines, and administrative positions, the introduction of women's studies courses and the opening of women's centres on campus mark an evolution in the nature of their education. Female faculty members in Canada, Britain and the United States are increasingly vocal in their demands for employment equity policies.[23] Women on university campuses are increasingly aware of the level of their involvement and the barriers to their equality with male members of the institution. Historians of women and higher education in Canada, however, are quick to point out that the university represents today, as it did in the past, a predominately patriarchal structure subject to the values of society and that the level and quality of education is determined, shaped and cultivated almost exclusively by men. The history of women and higher education was also, at one time, rendered invisible by male historians.[24]

The purpose of the present study is to explore some aspects of the history of women at the University of Windsor from approximately 1920 to the present. While the growing number of theses exploring the historical experience of women at Canadian universities testifies to this fruitful area of study, no attempt has been made to duplicate this at Windsor. Such institutional

studies are necessary, however, to gain a fuller understanding of both the unique and the common characteristics of women's experience. At the University of Windsor, a "separate and `different' education" for women, initially instituted by the Catholic founders of Holy Names College, evolved into an enduring characteristic of women's education. The sources of women's "separateness" on campus were both implicit and explicit and ranged from the physical separation of the sexes to disparities in the academic, administrative and political involvement and the attitudes expressed towards, women and men. Underlying each of these sources then, is the issue of gender and its ability to determine the nature of women's education and involvement on campus and in society as a whole.

This ideology of "separateness" was not a stagnant nor isolated concept but rather parallelled women's changing position in Canadian society. Before the students and staff at Holy Names joined the Assumption College campus in 1950, the separation of women and men into their "separate spheres" was a matter of explicit and deliberate doctrine. After the advent of coeducation, women and men were ostensibly free to intermingle but the implicit remnants of their "separateness" remained. In both the attitudes expressed towards their presence and in the nature of their education, women's experience continued to be defined by perceptions of their proper place in society.

Nor did the radical 1960's succeed in, nor attempt to dismantle implicit gender barriers to women's potential. With

the second wave of feminism, and the Women's Liberation Movement of the 1970's, however, the implicit sources and manifestations of this ideology of "separateness" were exposed and subjected to analysis and refutation. In so doing, the concept of women's "separate and `different' education" became explicit once again. Society had changed, however, and so had the University of Windsor. The ideology of "separateness" no longer represented an appropriate characteristic of women's experience. Thus, in the effort to eradicate it, women at Windsor have begun to rally for equity with men at all levels of the institution.

Endnotes to Introduction

1. Scholarship regarding women and higher education in the past in both the United States and Britain has produced a number of integrated and comprehensive studies. These include Resa Dudovitz, ed., Women in Academe (New York: Pergamon Press, 1984); Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, eds., Academic Women on the Move (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973); Patricia A. Graham and Todd Furniss, Women in Higher Education (Washington: Harper, 1974); Patricia A. Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion : A History of Women in American Higher Education," Signs 3,4, (Summer, 1978) : 759-773 ; Florence Howe, Myths of Coeducation : Selected Essays, 1964 - 1983, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); Betty Richardson, Sexism in Higher Education (New York: The Seabury Press, 1974); Marion Kilson "The Status of Women in Higher Education," Signs 1,4,(Summer, 1976) : 935-942 ; Bernice Sandler and Roberta Hall, The Campus Climate Revisited : Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators and Graduate Students (Washington: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American College, 1986); Barbara Miller Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women : A History of Women and Higher Education in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Robert F. Szafran, Universities and Women Faculty : Why Some Organizations Discriminate More Than Others (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984); Athena Theodore, The Campus Troublemakers : Academic Women in Protest (Houston: Cap and Gown Press, 1986); Jane L. Thompson, Learning Liberation : Women's Response to Men's Education (London: Croom Helm Press, 1983); Anne Spencer and David Podmore, eds., In a Man's World : Essays on Women in Male-Dominated Professions (London: Tavistock Publication, 1987).

2. The most outstanding examples include Judith Fingard, "College, Career and Community : Dalhousie Coeds, 1881-1921" in Youth, University and Canadian Society : Essays in the Social History of Higher Education, eds., Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid (Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1989), pp. 26-51; Judith Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie : Faculty Women Before 1959," Dalhousie Review 64, 4 (Winter 1984- 85) : 687-703; Margaret Gillett, We Walked Very Warily : A History of Women at McGill (Montreal: Eden Press, 1981); Anne Rochon Ford, A Path Not Strewn with Roses : One Hundred Years of Women at the University of Toronto (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Lee Jean Stewart, It's Up to You : Women at the University of British Columbia in the Early Years (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1990); Veronica Strong-Boag, "Feminism Constrained : The Graduates of Canada's Medical Schools for Women" in A Not Unreasonable Claim : Women and Reform in Canada, ed. Linda Kealy (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979). A number of relevant studies undertaken at the graduate level include Paula J. S.

studies undertaken at the graduate level include Paula J. S. Lapierre, "Separate or Mixed ? : The Debate Over Co-education at McGill," MA Thesis, McGill University, 1983 ; Nicole Neatby, "Women at Queen's in the 1920's : A Separate Sphere," MA Thesis, Queen's University, 1987 ; Nancy Kiefer, "The Impact of the Second World War on Female Students at the University of Toronto, 1939 - 1949," MA Thesis, University of Toronto, 1984 ; Anna Temple, "The Development of Higher Education for Women in Ontario, 1867 - 1919," Ph.D dissertation, Wayne State University, 1981 ; Nancy Ramsay Thompson, "The Controversy over the Admission of Women to University College, University of Toronto," MA Thesis, University of Toronto, 1974 ; Lee J Stewart, " The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia, 1906-1956," MA Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1987.

3. See Florence Howe, Myths of Coeducation, p. 290 "Coeducation -in elementary schools or in colleges- functions within the patriarchal limits of the society in which it exists". See also Jane Thompson, Learning Liberation, p. 30. "Gender has not been taken seriously and it is only with the re-emergence of feminism...that educational inequalities based on sex division have been identified as a major characteristic of educational systems".

4. Bonnie S. Anderson and Judith P. Zinner, A History of Their Own : Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present, vol. 1, (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), pp. xv - xviii.

5. The concept of gender and its employment as a category of historical analysis for the present study was influenced by, and developed from, the following sources : Jane Flax, "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory," Signs 12 (1987) : 621-643; Joan Kelly, "The Social Relations of the Sexes : Methodological Implications of Women's History", in Women, History and Theory : The Essays of Joan Kelly, ed. Catherine Stimpson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 1-19 ; Joan Scott, "Gender : A Useful Category of Historical Analysis" American Historical Review 91, 5, (December, 1986) : 1053-1075.

6. The lack of interpretive discussion regarding women and the history of higher education on Canada is discussed in Margaret Gillett, "Sexism in Higher Education," Atlantis 1, 1 (Fall, 1985): 79-98 ; Alison Prentice, "Towards a feminist history of women and education," in Monograms in Education, ed. D.C. Jones (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1981), pp. 57-69.

7. Neatby, "Women at Queen's in the 1920's," p. 1.

8. Prentice, "Towards a Feminist History," p. 59.

9. Chad Gaffield, "Back to School: Towards a New Agenda for the History of Education," Acadiensis XV, 2 (Spring, 1986) : 169-191; Paul Axelrod, "Historical Writing and Canadian Universities: The

State of the Art," Queen's Quarterly 89, 1 (Spring, 1982) : 128-139; "Introduction," Youth, University and Canadian Society, eds. Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, pp. 13-27.

10. Among them, Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada, Status of Women in Canadian Universities (Ottawa, 1975); Constance Backhouse, "Women Faculty at U.W.O.: Reflections on the Employment Equity Award," (University of Western Ontario, 1988); Dr. Milnor Alexander and A. J Aure, Chairpersons, Report of the President's Committee on the Status of Women Chairpersons (Regina: University of Regina, October, 1975); Patricia Cockburn and Yvonne Raymond, Women University Graduates in Continuing Education and Employment (Canadian Federation of University Women Study, 1966); Anne Innis Dagg, " The Status of Some Canadian Women Ph.D Scientists," Atlantis 11, 1 (Fall, 1958); Anne Innis Dagg and Patricia J. Thompson, Miseducation : Women and Canadian Universities (OISE: Toronto, 1988); Equal Rights Review and Coordinating Committee, Report to the Senate (Hamilton: McMaster University, 1976); Report of the President's Task Force on the Status of Women at the University of Guelph, Status of Women at the University of Guelph (Guelph: University of Guelph, 1957); Report on the Status of Women Committee, Report on the Status of Women - Laurentian University (Sudbury: Laurentian University, 1979); similar reports on the status of women have been undertaken at Mount Allison University (1975), University of Winnipeg (1976),University of New Brunswick (1979), Queen's University (1979), York University (1975). In its 1975 report, the Task Force on the Status of Women at York University commented, ironically, that "generally the situation of women in universities has been thoroughly investigated and that the time for study is over. Corrective action is long overdue." p. 1. See also, Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam, But Can You Type ? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women (Toronto: Clark Irwin, 1977).

11. See above note 1.

12. Margaret Gillett, "Sexism in Higher Education," Atlantis 1, 1 (Fall, 1975) : 79.

13. Margaret Gillett, "The Seahorse Society," McGill Journal of Education X, 1 (Spring, 1975) : 47.

14. See above note 2.

15. Louise Lander, Images of Bleeding - Menstruation as Ideology (New York: Orlando Press, 1988), pp. 5-7.

16. Lapierre, "Separate or Mixed," p. 5.

17. Ibid., p. 2.

18. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Puberty to Menopause : The Cycle of Femininity in Nineteenth-Century America," in Clio's Consciousness Raised : New Perspectives on the History of Women, eds. Mary Hartman and Lois Banner (New York: Octagon Books, 1976), pp. 23-37.

19. Temple, " The Development of Higher Education for Women," p. 71.

20. Stewart, "The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia," p. 1. and Neatby, "Women at Queen's in the 1920's," p. 3.

21. Lapierre, "Separate or Mixed ?," p. 22. See also Veronica Strong-Boag, The New Day Recalled - Lives of Girls and Women in Canada, 1919-1939 (Toronto: Clark Irwin, 1988).

22. Neil Guppy, Doug Balson and Susan Vellutini, "Women and Higher Education in Canadian Society" in Women and Education : A Canadian Perspective, eds. Jane Gaskell and Arlene McLaren (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1987), pp. 171-193.

23. Betty Richardson, Sexism in Higher Education (New York: The Seabury Press, 1974) p. 155 ; Patricia Lattin Hopkins, "Academic Women, Affirmative Action and Mid-America in the Eighties," in Women in Academe, ed. Resa Dudovitz, p. 228 ; Linda Briskin, "Underrepresentation of women, anti-feminism and affirmative action," OCUFA Forum 6, 21, (April 1990) : 3; George Roche, The Balancing Act : Quota Hiring in Higher Education (Illinois: Open Court Publishers, 1974), p. 48 .

24. Margaret Gillett, "Sexism in Higher Education," p. 82.

Chapter One

" Training the Angels of Goodness "
St. Mary's Academy and the Beginnings of Holy Names College
1864 - 1940

St. Mary's Academy for the education of young women in the Windsor area was founded in 1864 by the Sisters of the Holy names of Jesus and Mary. The order was originally founded in France in 1800 by Monsignor Eugene de Mazenod. In 1844, Bishop Bourget, hoping to duplicate the success of the Sisters in Canada, applied to the Mother House to have a congregation sent to Montreal. The order was relatively young and still under close direction, however, so Mother St. Augustine, the foundress in Marseilles, encouraged the Bishop to form a Canadian community fashioned after the same plan and with similar aims as that in France. In 1844, three members, Eulalie Durocher, Melodie Dufresne and Henriette Core took their final vows and became the first of the order of the Sisters of the Holy Names in Canada. The order grew rapidly and soon numbered over two thousand members. [1]

The Sisters arrived in Canada at a time when the nature of education of the country's youth was changing. In the 1860's, education at both the elementary and secondary level became free

and compulsory. [2] The presence of girls in grammar schools, however, had been accepted only reluctantly. School inspectors were appalled at the number of young women studying Latin : a subject reserved for the young men in their pursuit of a classical education. Registration in Latin or Greek determined the level of government funding received by each school. Thus, while 85 of the 102 grammar schools admitted girls, the all-male schools, often with lower enrolments, did not receive the same beneficial effects of the new funding formula. [3] In his educational journals of 1867 and 1869, Egerton Ryerson, an instrumental figure in the creation of the Ontario School System, stated that

> I regret to observe that the evil of introducing girls to enter the Grammar Schools has increased, a course of action contrary to the Grammar School Law...The Grammar School fund was intended for the classical, mathematical and higher education of boys. [4]

Ryerson's comments point out that although the official policy excluded girls from the grammar schools, it was breached. Young women were attending the schools but the characterization of their presence as an "evil" undermines the notion that they did so without some degree of hesitation on the part of school officials. Women learning "male" subjects most certainly represented a threat to the proper social order. Perhaps educators such as Ryerson feared the consequences of empowering women through the exposure to "male" education and thus took measures to restrict their access. Clearly, they were not perceived as deserving of an education in the identical manner as

the young men.

In 1868, a proposal was introduced to disqualify girls from receiving grant funds entirely.[5] The ensuing confusion over the proper approach for grammar school funding brought the education of young girls to the forefront. Despite the decrees of the education department, parents did not stop sending their daughters to the local grammar school nor did local administrators stop accepting them as students.

While the education of young men and women in the mid-1800's reflected society's notion of "separate spheres" for the sexes, women did have a number of educational options. A large number of young women from various social classes continued to receive their education at home. After the quality and regularity of the common school was ensured, young women did attend if only when their duties at home were completed. The growth of private venture schools in towns and cities catered to a broad spectrum of society and often presented an opportunity for young women to receive a high level of education. The ideal female education in the late 1860's represented a mixture of the useful, ornamental and intellectual. As Canadian society matured, so too did attitudes towards the merit of a well-educated wife or daughter. A clever and refined woman was an obvious social asset to a father or a husband and an education increased her chances of securing an advantageous marriage.[6]

Private schools and academies, such as St. Mary's Academy in Windsor, admitted girls or were intended for them alone. Often

organized around a particular religious affiliation, these institutions represented another option for young women. Denominational schools insisted, however, on becoming a separate entity from the public schools. While "respectable religion" had been pushed in the common schools, both Protestants and Roman Catholics insisted on directing their faithful under a separate system that placed greater emphasis on the tenets of their faith. [7]

Canadian Catholics, like those in other countries, placed religious instruction in the centre of a proper education. Assumption College, founded in 1854, was educating the young men of the Windsor area but the people were left without a religious congregation of women to "care for their daughters". [8] In 1864, after several failed attempts to secure a teaching congregation for their daughters, a number of Windsor Catholic School Trustees, acting on the advice of Bishop Pinsonneault, invited the Sisters of the Holy Names to come to Windsor. [9]

The importance of an education firmly grounded in Catholicism for the people of Windsor is demonstrated in a Pastoral Letter on Education issued by Bishop John Walsh, Bishop Pinsonneault's successor, in 1872. The Bishop's ruling on the centrality of a Catholic education for Windsor youth, regardless of gender, sought to save souls from damnation.

> The Church requires that the study of religion should hold first place in the education of our children and that all other studies be subordinate... In the Public Schools of Ontario, Education is neither Christian nor moral ; consequently, no Catholic can either support these schools or send their children to them without incurring excommunication. [10]

According to the ruling of Bishop Walsh, it was the duty of local Catholics to ensure that their children receive an education firmly grounded in Catholic doctrine. The education of young Catholic men and women, however, was to take place separately. Young women could not attend Assumption College at this time. This separation of the sexes was not, however, limited to Catholic institutions. At Mount Allison, New Brunswick, a non-Catholic institution, a similar arrangement took place. The female academy opened in 1854 in close proximity to the male academy but the female branch was to remain "entirely distinct...and the students of the different branches will not be allowed to associate or even to meet, either in public or in private, except in the presence of some officers of the Institution". [11] Like Mount Allison, St. Mary's Academy provided an education for young women in the area but both were "all female enclaves". [12] At the Academy, women exercised power, "but only by isolating women and girls from the public world of men". [13]

The stated purpose of St. Mary's Academy and the Sisters of the Holy Names was to "exemplify the pioneering spirit of the foundress, and to embody the best of Catholic tradition and academic teaching." [14] The Sisters of the Holy Names at the Academy were constantly reminded of their obligation to "study and become competent, expert teachers." [15] Viewed as an expression of their devotion to the Church, the activities of the Sisters of the Holy Names, along with those of other teaching and

social service orders, were encouraged by the Church leaders. [16] The Sisters of the Holy Names were encouraged to demonstrate their "feminine spirituality and initiative" through the moral and academic instruction of young women. [17] The instruction was based in Catholic theology which viewed women's ideal role as either wife and mother or nun. Whether in public or private schools, Protestant or Catholic, women were taught what was considered suitable to their sphere. From its earliest inception the Sisters sought to direct not only the intellectual development of their students but the social and cultural as well.

The education received at St. Mary's Academy was shaped and determined not only by religious doctrine, but by the Canadian social climate. Much of women's lives in Canadian society during the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, was dictated by a larger "traditional gender ideology". This ideology informed all aspects of women's lives and was intimately related to the concept of "separate spheres". [18] The concept of "separate spheres" maintained that women and men should perform different tasks and should concern themselves with separate and complementary aspects of everyday life: men should be concerned with the public and women with the private and domestic.

As a central concept in understanding the social climate surrounding women's lives in the mid-nineteenth century in Canada, it is instructive to explore briefly the origins of the concept of "separate spheres". The notion of "separate spheres"

has its origins in the industrial revolution and middle-class culture of the mid-nineteenth century. With the onset of industrialization, the home was no longer the workplace. While men and women performed different tasks prior to the growth of factories, the industrial revolution "broadened the distinctions between men's and women's occupations". [19] Thus, the separation of the activities of men and women into "separate spheres" has been identified as a consequence of the coming of the factory and of wage labour.

Women of the lower classes went to work in the factories and generally benefitted from this transformation. This new source of economic competition was viewed negatively by male workers, however, and by members of the middle and upper classes. Men reacted to the employment of women and children by opposing equal wages for their work. Moral reformers, many of whom were of the upper classes, argued that the factory system was an agent of degredation and that lower class workers indulged too frequently in alcohol and other abuses. Others, opposed to the change, argued that women were naturally inferior and did not have equal economic responsibilities with male breadwinners. Certain tasks were thus designated "women's work" and paid with lower wages. Despite this obvious exploitation and discrimination, working-class women who needed jobs to support themselves and their families took advantage of the new opportunities.

Women from the middle and upper classes were discouraged from entering the factory on the basis that it was "morally

dangerous" to do so. The factories, and the women who found employment there, were portrayed as corrupt - both morally and spiritually. Education became the accepted path for women of the middling and upper classes. They came to dominate those professions that dealt intimately with women and children, not the unacceptable world of labour unions and factories. Occupations that they engaged in such as teaching, nursing and social work also became stereotyped as "women's work" and were paid lower than those dominated by men. [20]

By the mid-1800's, however, the relegation of women to the domestic sphere was directly challenged and a debate over the "woman question" in Canada ensued. For a portion of the population, the rhetoric espoused about women's lives and the reality of their lives seemed at odds. Similarly in the United States and Britain, the "code of true womanhood invoking the ideal of the republican and Christian wife and mother", dictated women's existence and became a focal point of opinion and debate. [21]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, middle and upper-class women in Canada and in European countries began to demand a voice in the public realm. As mothers and managers of families, they proclaimed, they had the need and the right to exercise influence over the world outside the home. Their charitable efforts expanded in scope and activists soon became the objects of public criticism. [22] The resulting arguments that arose in response to such criticism incorporated two perspectives : "maternal" or "social" feminism and "equal rights" or "equity"

feminism.[23]

The doctrine of maternal feminism, the most characteristic of Canadian feminism during this period, was based on the middle and upper-class woman's role as guardian of the home. Arguing that women had special experience that could prove crucial to society, women activists demanded more political representation to guarantee the family's protection from society's inherent evils. Unless women were given the vote, they argued, society could not be reformed.

The equal rights brand of feminism focused more directly on arguments of "simple justice".[24] This particular viewpoint stressed how unjust it was to curtail women's rights based solely on their gender. The vote became, in essence, a symbol of their full participation as citizens. The "votes for Women" issue was a radical one that many women hesitated to endorse because many men found the idea completely outrageous.

The legislation that women reformers in Canada lobbied for, such as temperance, prohibition, and suffrage, was designed to protect women and to uphold the family. Since working class women in Canada had always been a significant part of the workplace outside the home, the controversy had more relevance to women of the middle and upper-classes. Nevertheless, women were making much more public demands for power in the private and domestic world. The activist groups provided a resource for representation and sisterhood, although predominately for those women who shared their social status. It is significant to note also that the

actions of reformers sought to protect women's traditional interests. The centrality of their role in the family as mothers and and as agents of moral reform was upheld in the ideology of maternal feminism and found expression in the newer demands for social reform. The majority of middle and upper class Canadian women did not want to enter the world outside the home for the purpose of gaining equality with men. Rather, they entered the public arena to guarantee their prominence in, and the protection of, the private domain. Ultimately, their activity challenged the boundaries of separate spheres but did not dismantle them.

In arguments supporting the higher education of women, therefore, the "domestic" benefits of educated women were stressed. Commenting on the proper nature of higher education for Canadian women in 1875, the writer "Fidelis" maintained that

> By training women's intellect they would certainly become more intelligent companions, even counsellors to their husbands...How much better fitted, too might mothers become for the care of children and invalids.[25]

Fidelis, in pointing out the benefits that men might receive from an educated woman, clearly advocated a type of education for women that was to be utilized and thought about differently from that received by men. By demonstrating that an educated woman was not a threat to convention but rather a better equipped housewife, the author presented a convincing argument for opening up Canadian universities to women.

While the activities and interests of Canadian women at the end of the nineteenth century began to challenge social

perceptions of the boundaries of their appropriate sphere, religious communities continued to view differences between men and women as "divinely ordained". In the secular world, doctors argued that women who partook in strenuous activity, mental or physical, threatened their reproductive powers. Religious thinkers, however, found a moral argument for the separation of the spheres.

> It was God's will that women should spend their lives as guardians of the home. By running the home and bringing up children women were fulfilling God's intention that men and women should complement each other's work.[26]

It was clear from the teachings of the Church leaders during the first half of the twentieth century that the Catholic woman's role in the world was different from that of her male counterpart. Mary Daly has suggested that the Catholic Church actively supported and promoted a "separate and `different' education" for women, particularly apparent in Pope Pius XI's 1929 encyclical letter on the Christian education of youth. Pius XI proclaimed, in part, that

> the creator has ordained and disposed perfect union of the sexes only in matrimony and with varying degrees of contact, in the family and in society. Besides there is not in nature itself, which fashions the two quite differently in organism, in temperament, in ability, anything to suggest that there can be or ought to be promiscuity, and much less equality in the training of the two sexes.[27]

The essential message to Catholic educators was that, based on God's will, women and men should not receive the same type of education. In the Catholic Church, as in the rest of society, gender had a significant part to play in determining the scope

and nature of women's activities. [28] At St. Mary's Academy, the educators complied with the doctrine of women's "separate and `different' education" and trained their young students to assume an essentially nurturing role that would complement, not compete with, the education received by their male counterparts at Assumption.

Although secular educators retained the notion that women could serve society as educated wives and mothers into the early twentieth century, they also encouraged them to "move beyond the familial sphere and experiment in other fields". [29] Catholic academies often differed from public schools in the "disproportionate emphasis" placed on religious instruction in the former. [30] Convent school girls, and those trained by religious in academies, received official sanction for two career choices : a religious vocation or a cultured homemaker. These career choices, however, were regarded as the ideal life direction for young Catholic women. By the turn of the nineteenth century, vocational courses appeared in the curriculum of Catholic girls schools. Most teaching orders began to offer commercial subjects and courses leading to a teacher's certificate. The addition of vocational courses, such as stenography and typing, indicates an awareness on the part of Catholic educators that some graduates would neither marry nor enter the convent. Nonetheless, the inclusion of courses and training that prepared some women for work outside the home did not indicate a change in the conception of the ideal roles for

Catholic women.

From its earliest inception, St. Mary's Academy sought to direct the intellectual, social and moral education of its students. In his 1914 address to the Academy's alumni, Reverend P.J. Howard of Assumption College for young men offered his appraisal of the lasting value imparted by the Sisters' instruction :

> They so cultivate the faculties of the soul, that side by side, with the flowers of virtue, they germinate and foster the purest appreciation of fine arts, a love of literary excellence, of painting, of music. [31]

The end result of this cultivation, according to Reverend Howard, was a well-prepared young lady, "trained to take her place in whatever sphere fortune assigns her, a model of courtesy, a type of social ease of manners and an angel of goodness." [32] Offering his praise to the work of the Sisters, J.E. Power, then inspector of Separate Schools in Windsor, remarked that "no more convincing argument can be found in favour of higher education for women than in religious communities such as yours, whose members prove that the finest type of womanliness is the inevitable, rather than the accidental, outcome of the highest intellectual training." [33] The "highest intellectual training" referred to by Power involved the Sister's cultivation of the "self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness so essential to woman as a maker of happiness." [34] These particular observers, who had the occasion to comment on the meaning of an education received at St. Mary's, focussed specifically on the nurturing and angelic

qualities of the graduates. In so doing, these prominent male members of the Catholic community in Windsor issued a final reminder of the young women's proper role in the world. The emphasis placed on women's powerlessness and deference to her "natural" role as a "maker of happiness", however, tended to turn the occasions of Academy commencements and alumni addresses into "forums for anti-feminist views". [35] Clearly, an important goal of the Academy was to prepare a host of young women that would, as the "maker of happiness", become the moral and spiritual protector of the family. She was also, however, given training that would prepare her for work outside the home. [36] This aspect of the graduate's education tended to be downplayed in commentators remarks.

Despite the apparently secondary place given to the preparation of working women in offical statements, the Academy had some impressive facilities. The new St. Mary's Academy had, in addition to general courses, a Music department with 25 individual studies each furnished with a piano. The third floor Art Studio was complete with a roof garden for artistic inspiration. Chemistry and physics laboratories were available as was a commercial department in which typing and stenography were taught. The Academy also housed a library, two recreation rooms and a Home Economics department "designed to teach young women the art of homemaking, an art which is the very foundation of healthy, happy family living." [37] In training the young women in skills most appropriate to their sex, the recruitment of

students for the religious life was a secondary goal of St. Mary's. A gothic -style Chapel, "one of the largest and most beautiful of its kind on Canada", dominated the Academy. [38] In all, the Academy was nestled "in an atmosphere conducive to the development of the total feminine personality and aimed to emphasize woman's role in the world." [39]

The educational program offered at St. Mary's clearly acknowledged that a number of their graduates would neither marry nor enter the convent. A number of Canadian women, particularly the middle-class, maintained that, as mothers and homemakers, their skills and knowledge, while different from men's, was just as valuable. With industrialization and the growth of secondary industry, these women were finding paid labour outside the home that was perceived as appropriate for their sex and their social status. [40] The employment fields in which these women predominated were largely extensions of their existing sphere : domestic service, clerical work, nursing and teaching. In the late nineteenth century, a new educational campaign, aimed at providing practical training in schools for young women and men, witnessed the growth of domestic science programs for women and manual training for men. [41]

The development of a Home Economics or a Domestic Science program for young women in Canada demonstrated most clearly the perceived association of woman with the domestic role. As an academic discipline aimed at women, the significance of Home Economics has been the object of rigourous historical debate. In

her study on the experience of women at the University of British Columbia, for example, Lee Jean Stewart argues that the Home Economics movement attracted both "conservatives and reformers". [42] The conservative women insisted upon a curriculum that would teach women to be primarily housewives and mothers. The reforming women, however, wanted to develop a Home Economics movement that would provide the female complement to professional male-dominated schools. Essentially, the development of a Home Economics movement successfully separated women and their perceived interests from those of their male counterparts. Stewart concludes that "historically then, the Home Economics movement was a `separatist' strategy that promoted education to prepare women for their life's work." [43]

In the beginning, Adelaide Hoodless, the originator of the Home Economics movement in Canada, intended this education to act as a means of ensuring the protection of the family through proper education in the storage and preparation of food and the treatment of disease. [44] Hoodless believed that this practical training for women would elevate their status within the family and society. The presence of Home Economics courses at St. Mary's indicates that the Sister's recognized that it was important and valuable to produce expert housewives and mothers, not just competent ones. [45] Although non-traditional disciplines such as chemistry and physics were taught at the Academy, the evidence does not suggest that they were of the academic calibre to prepare the young women for a career as a

doctor or as a scientist, nor were they intended to do so. Instead, the women were prepared to occupy a different role than their male counterparts. As the moral protectors of the family and of society, women were expected to approach their role professionally and to become adept housewives and mothers for their husbands and children. [46]

The founding of a women's college at St. Mary's, eventually named Holy Names College, in 1934 was late compared to other institutions in Canada. By the end of the nineteenth century in Canada, most people supported the higher education of women provided that it was conducted separately from men and reflected society's perception of women's proper sphere. Initially, the main thrust of a university education was to make women more cultured marriage partners. [47] Women had been attending university in Canada, the United States and Britain long before Holy Names opened. In Canada, Mount Allison admitted women from its founding in 1862. Victoria College, located at Cobourg, Ontario, admitted women in 1877. Queen's University in Kingston admitted women in 1876, Acadia in 1880, and Dalhousie in 1881. Trinity College at Toronto opened its doors to women in 1889. [48]

The plan to found Holy Names began initially in 1924 when Sister Mary of the Cross and Sister Mary Electa submitted their proposal to the Order's General Council in Montreal. The General Council gave its enthusiastic support and promised to send three additional members to augment the College's staff. [49] But Bishop Fallon of London refused to approve the College,

apparently resenting the fact he was the last to be consulted and had learned of the Sisters' project only through "outside sources unfriendly to the proposal." [50] With a Catholic women's college already established in London, namely Brescia Hall, the Bishop further stated that he was reluctant to have two schools in the same diocese competing for students. [51] The situation changed with the death of Bishop Fallon. His replacement, Bishop John Kidd, "deplored the absence of a Catholic College for women in Windsor", suggesting that his predecessor's hesitancy to allow two competing women's colleges in the diocese was groundless. [52] Bishop Kidd required the Sisters to survey the number of students likely to attend Brescia College in London, their school standing, means and home location, and the number of students Holy Names might be able to accommodate for a small tuition fee. [53] After examining the data, Bishop Kidd encouraged the Sisters to begin their own College.

Because a significant proportion of the students at Assumption College were being trained for the priesthood, Church authorities considered the presence of women at their facility inconceivable. In a letter of October 7, 1938 to Rev. T. MacDonald, Superior of Assumption College from 1931 - 1940, Bishop Kidd reaffirmed the importance of the segregation of male and female students based upon the newly approved direction for Catholic seminaries and universities circulated by the Pope. Bishop Kidd stated that

> those aspiring to the priesthood should be separated as far as possible from other students

> in colleges. Laywomen and girls are not to be permitted in seminaries or colleges. [54]

In a letter of November 22, 1938, the Bishop remarked that

> we have made application to the University of Western Ontario to have St. Peter's Seminary affiliated directly to the University instead of through Brescia Hall. Our principal reason for it is that Rome does not like a seminary to be so attached to a Ladies College. [55]

Bishop Kidd's concern over the spiritual well-being of the celibate seminarians, in part, accounts for his endorsement of the construction of a women's college at St. Mary's in 1934. The Bishop supported a Catholic education for female students wishing to earn a university degree. It is apparent, however, that this undertaking had to be maintained at an acceptable distance from Assumption. The notion of women as potential temptresses for the seminarians at Assumption, implied in the cautionary words of Bishop Kidd, negated any possibility that they could attend the male college.

> For some there was even a further assumption: Eve's succumbing to the serpent's temptation showed that women were innately sinful. This was an added reason for not allowing them to attend universities since they would be a constant distraction to men. [56]

The attitude towards women prevalent in the Church at this time meant that the close proximity of young men and young women at a university "posed a serious threat to convention." [57]

That Holy Names was able to come to fruition during the Depression years in Canada was, according to Helen Batte, directly attributable to Bishop Kidd. Not only had the Bishop given his approval for the College, but he had also secured the

funds necessary for it to open by "floating" a diocesan bond issue, the "first of its kind in Canada." [58] With the necessary capital in place, Holy Names was among the twenty-one new parishes, the twenty-five new schools and the seven new missions founded by the Bishop during this period. The Sisters at St. Mary's had kept their tuition fees affordable for people in the Windsor area and this policy was carried over to Holy Names. Although the tuition remained relatively low, the students at Holy Names must have come from families financially secure enough to pay it.

The nature of the education received at Holy Names College was not very different from that at St. Mary's Academy. In its first year of operation, forty-four students attended Holy Names, twenty of whom were postulants. [59] While it did not represent its primary reason for existence, one of the benefits of establishing an institution of higher education for young women was its potential to produce recruits for the Sisters of the Holy Names. At the time, the faculty consisted of three priests from Assumption College, seven sisters, and two laypeople. The priests conducted lectures in Religious Knowledge, Philosophy and Greek. Subjects under the direction of the Sisters included English, Latin, Economic and Political Science, Public Speaking, History, Science, French, and Mathematics. German and Library Science were under the direction of two laypersons. [60]

Students who enrolled at Holy Names could obtain either a general Bachelor of Arts degree or a certificate in Home

Economics. An analysis of the graduating class of 1938 reveals that, upon graduation, four of the total of nineteen students left Holy Names to attend other universities. One graduate, for example, was attending library school at the University of Toronto, while another student had enrolled at the Ontario College of Education. A number of students sought employment after graduation. Six graduates left Holy Names to assume secretarial positions, while three became librarians and two assumed teaching positions in Ontario high schools. Two of the graduates listed no current occupation, simply stating their present address. The remaining two students were employed as nursing assistants at Hotel Dieu Hospital in Windsor.[61]

The introduction of a new Home Economics Department at Holy Names in 1940 attracted eight students. Unlike other Home Economics or Domestic Science programs aimed at providing a vocation as a dietician or a textile specialist, this program followed a more traditional approach. Young women who enrolled in the department learned three basic skills : cleaning, sewing and cooking.[62] The Border Cities Star reported enthusiastically that " it is expected the number will increase steadily since homemaking is the career followed by the majority of women."[63]

The training at Holy Names paralleled larger trends in the nature of women's education in the 1920's and 1930's. Those Holy Names graduates who sought employment after graduation took their place in the traditionally "female" occupations. As Veronica

Strong-Boag suggests, "an arts education prepared young women for the career opportunities that existed for their sex, notably as teachers, social workers, librarians, clerical workers, saleswomen and wives." [64] Writing in 1930, education critic J.A. Lindsay observed

> Sydney Smith once said: "Women will never desert the cradle for a quadratic equation." The choice, however, is not always up to her. [65]

Lindsay's comment points out that women were perceived to be closely tied to their reproductive functions and that no amount of education would override the duty of wife and mother.

While the influence of Catholic doctrine regarding women added further credence and legitimacy to an educational program that greatly promoted women's domestic role, the training also prepared them for appropriate jobs outside the home, frequently those involving nurturing and care-giving. Marni Frazier De Pencier maintains that the "choice of an Arts education for the majority of women represented a fairly accurate appraisal of the limited opportunities open to most women after graduation." [66] Thus, while the education received at Holy Names sought to prepare women firstly for their "divinely ordained" role as wife and mother, it did give its graduates the necessary skills to perform the limited tasks that society deemed appropriate outside the home.

Holy Names College sought to prepare women for those roles in Canadian society and, more specifically, within the Church, that were deemed palatable for their sex. The Catholic ideal,

however, held that women should strive to become either nuns or wives and mothers. The educators at Holy Names realized that some women would have to seek employment as a prelude to or in the absence of marriage. Thus, strict Catholic theology with regard to the proper role of women often stood in sharp contrast to the reality of women's lives. The comments of Reverend Les Munnelly to the Holy Names class of 1946, for example, underscores the tension between the purpose of a liberal arts education for women and the various professional programs available at the college. Reverend Munnelly remarked in part that

> If our liberal education is to be preserved, it falls to the responsibility of the woman. She must have the breadth of vision to form a counterbalance in this world of specialists and experts. Therefore her training must be more broadly cultural, and she must possess the mother's sense to be a jill-of-all-trades.[67]

In offering courses that could allow some women to seek employment outside the home, Catholic educators at the College appeared to be sensitive to their needs. Nevertheless, Reverend Munnelly's appraisal of the meaning of a higher education for women stresses their role as a motherly "transmitter" of culture, not as future doctors and lawyers. If their graduates were to occupy jobs outside the home, they would most likely represent those professions in which women dominated, such as teaching, nursing and in the area of social service. Women were not expected nor encouraged to enter traditionally male occupations.

In actively promoting a "separate and `different' education"

for women, the Sisters of the Holy Names sought to prepare their students for the traditional and appropriate spheres available to them. They were to be strictly separated from the male students at Assumption and their curriculum was aimed at the training of demure helpmates for male breadwinners or at the preparation for acceptable positions of care-giver outside the home. There was no indication made that the graduates of Holy Names were to be actively competing with their male counterparts for employment after graduation.

The Second World War significantly altered the purpose of a university. Public figures began to describe it as the "intellectual resource of the state". [68] Paul Axelrod argues that "aside from the training of manpower, the universities performed another valuable and highly acclaimed wartime function: scientific and military research." [69] Graduates of Holy Names did not engage in scientific or military research but rather entered more traditional occupations such as teaching, nursing and clerical work. Barbara Miller Solomon maintains that a liberal education for men, unlike women, "started them on the path to a future in a profession or business or public life." [70] A liberal education for women was considered as learning for its own sake and "did not fundamentally threaten the primacy of the family headed by the male breadwinner." [71] Thus, even in terms of the meaning of a liberal arts education, the goal for men and women was considered to be separate and different. The introduction of coeducation at Assumption in 1950 took place

within the context of this traditional gender ideology and therefore did not significantly alter this notion of a "separate and `different' education" for women. [72]

Endnotes to Chapter One

1. Ellen Mayville Montreuil, Helen Schell, K. Sadler, Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of St. Mary's Academy: College of the Holy Names, Windsor, Ontario, 1864 - 1914 (Detroit: Sister's of the Holy Names, 1915), pp. 1-6.

2. Temple, "The Development of Higher Education for Women," p. 30.

3. Susan E. Houston and Alison Prentice, Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth - Century Ontario (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 321.

4. Helen Batte (Sister John Thomas), Rooted in Hope: A History of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary of the Ontario Province (Windsor: Paulist Press, 1983), p. 46.

5. Houston and Prentice,Schooling and Scholars, p. 321.

6. Ibid., p. 321.

7. Alison Prentice, The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), pp. 74-75.

8. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 5.

9. Ibid., p. 5.

10. Ibid., p. 52.

11. John G. Reid, "The Education of Women at Mount Allison, 1854-1914," Acadiensis XII, 2 (Spring, 1987) : 6.

12. Alison Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History (Toronto : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), p. 96.

13. Ibid., p. 96.

14. Montreuil, Schell and Sadler, Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of St. Mary's Academy, p. 1.

15. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 246.

16. Marta Danylewycz, Taking the Veil: An Alternative to Marriage, Motherhood, and Spinsterhood in Quebec, 1840-1920 (Toronto: Copp Clark Irwin, 1987), pp. 46-47.

17. Ibid., pp. 46-47.

18. Lynn Gordon, "Coeducation on Two Campuses: Berkeley and Chicago, 1890-1912" in Woman's Being, Woman's Place, ed. Mary Kelly (Boston: G.K. Hall and Company, 1979), pp. 179-180.

19. Aileen S. Kraditor, ed.,Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. xi.

20. Linda Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," Journal of American History (June 1988) : 11.

21. Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women, p. 27.

22. Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History, p. 169.

23. Ibid., p. 169.

24. Ibid., p. 169.

25. Fidelis, "Higher Education for Women", Canadian Monthly 7 (January, 1875) : 152. In The Widening Sphere: Women in Canada, 1870 - 1949 (Minister of Supply and Services Canada: Public Archives of Canada, 1982), p. 1, author Jeanne L`Esperance points out that "Fidelis" was in fact a pseudonym used by Agnes Machar, daughter of the acting principal of Queen's University.

26. Joan N. Burstyn, "Religious Arguments Against Higher Education for Women in England, 1840-1890," Women's Studies 1, 1 (1972) : 113.

27. Mary Daly, The Church and the Second Sex (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 42.

28. Rosemary Radford Ruether, Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power (New York: Paulist Press, 1972), p. 99. In her section entitled "Is Christianity Misogynist? The Failure of Women's Liberation in the Church", Ruether presents a similar argument to that of Daly. Ruether also maintains that the teachings of clergymen succeeded in shoring up the ideology of separate spheres present in the arguments of secular theorists.

29. Eileen Mary Brewer, Nuns and the Education of American Catholic Women, 1860 - 1920, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1987) p. 11.

30. Ibid., p. 48.

31. Montreuil, Schell and Sadler, Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of St. Mary's Academy, pp. 79-80.

32. Ibid., p. 79.

33. Ibid., p. 116.

34. Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, Saint Mary's Academy 1864 - 1977: Memoirs (Windsor: Sisters of the Holy Names, 1978), p. 16.

35. Brewer, Nuns and the Education of American Catholic Women, 1860 - 1920, p. 111.

36. See Marta Danlewycz, "Changing Relationships : Nuns and Feminists in Montreal, 1890 - 1925" in The Neglected Majority - Essays in Canadian Women's History, Volume 2, eds. Alison Prentice and Susan Mann Trofimenkoff (Toronto : McClelland and Stewart,1985), p. 122. In Danylewycz"s interpretation, various orders of nuns originating in Quebec had a considerable impact on the extension of acceptable types of women's work outside the home. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the "child-centred, family reinforcement objectives" of many English - Canadian and American social feminists were directly in line with the activities of religious orders in Quebec.

37. Border Cities Star, Sept. 3, 1929, p. 2.

38. Ibid., p. 2.

39. Ibid., p. 2.

40. Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History, p. 113.

41. Ibid., p. 157.

42. Stewart, "The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia," p. 76.

43. Ibid., p. 76.

44. Robert M. Stamp, "Teaching Girls Their `God-Given Place in Life' : The Introduction of Home Economics in the Schools," Atlantis 2, 2 Part 1 (Spring 1977) : 67.

45. Lapierre, "Separate or Mixed ?," p. 22.

46. Ibid., p. 22.

47. Ibid., p. 246.

48. Lapierre, "Separate or Mixed ?," p. 20.

49. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 250.

50. Ibid., pp. 250-251.

51. Ibid., p. 251.

52. Ibid., p. 246.

53. Ibid., p. 246.

54. Bishop John Kidd to Reverend T. MacDonald, October 7, 1938, Record Group 1, Box 5, File 4, Assumption University Archives, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

55. Ibid., November 22, 1938, Record Group 1, Box 5, File 4, Assumption University Archives, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

56. Burstyn, "Religious Arguments Against Higher Education for Women," p. 125.

57. Ibid., p. 125.

58. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 246.

59. Ibid., p. 247.

60. Holy Names College Brochure, 1934, p. 2.

61. Ambassador Yearbook (Windsor: Assumption College, 1939), p. 105.

62. Sisters of the Holy Names, Memoirs, p. 116.

63. Ibid., p. 17.

64. Veronica Strong-Boag, The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in Canada , 1919 - 1939 (Toronto: Copp Clarke, 1988) p. 3

65. J. A. Lindsay, "Sex in Education", Dalhousie Review X, 2 (July, 1930) : 149.

66. Marni Frazier De Pencier, "Ideas of the English-Speaking Universities in Canada to 1920," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1978, p. 655.

67. Windsor Daily Star, May 20, 1946, p. 14.

68. Frazier De Pencier, "Ideas of the English - Speaking Universities," p. 655.

69. Paul Axelrod, Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980 (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983), p. 16.

70. Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women, p. 83.

71. Strong-Boag, Lives of Girls and Women, p. 44.

72. Victoria Bissell Brown, "The Fear of Feminization: Los Angeles High Schools in the Progressive Era", Feminist Studies 16, 3 (Fall 1990): 493. In characterizing the experience of women in institutes of higher learning in America from 1880 - 1910, Bissell Brown concludes similarly that "from the very beginning, coeducation at the college level carried explicit contingencies - that female students not threaten men's dominance in the classroom or on campus and that grads use their college education to be better wives and mothers..."

Chapter Two
"The Advent of Femininity"
Holy Names College and Coeducation at Assumption

The nature of education received by Windsor women at St. Mary's Academy and Holy Names College reflected society's perception of women's role in the world. In the late 1800's, "women were regarded as the nurturers and the repositors of cultural, social and familial values." [1] The education women received during this period emphasized women's perceived proclivity for the domestic and service-oriented arenas. In keeping with this ideology, the curriculum at St. Mary's was designed "to train girls in the arts and graces of life". [2]

By the turn of the century, the debate over the higher education of women had shifted from a matter of whether or not to educate her at all, to a discussion of the proper form that education should take. The notion that men and women be educated together, coeducation, was deemed palatable as long as what were believed to be the "natural differences" between men and women were reflected in that education. While coeducation gave the appearance of a uniformity and an equality of experience among men and women, the separation of the sexes was maintained in a variety of ways. Affiliation between Holy Names College and

Assumption College, for example, was based upon the strict separation of the sexes until 1950. In his recollections of Assumption College, Al Roach, a former student at Assumption, observed that as late as 1946 women were absent from the College except in an non-academic capacity. Roach characterized the experience thus :

> Assumption College. Mid 1940's. Boys from Grade 9 to the Master's degree level all on one small campus. Taught by a male staff, ninety per cent members of the Congregation of St. Basil. Not a female in sight. Except the quiet Grey Nuns cleaning the dormitories in St. Michael's Hall.[3]

With the advent of coeducation, the meaning of women's "separate and `different' education" was changing. Previously, women and men were strictly separated from one another, both physically and in the perception of their proper academic goals. The "separateness" of women after the introduction of coeducation, while not always explicit, was often implicitly assured by the attitudes expressed towards their presence and the institution's response to their needs. The advent of coeducation at Assumption, therefore, did not eradicate the conception of a "separate and `different' education" for women. Manifested in subtler, yet equally powerful ways, the sources of women's implicit separation at Assumption continued to influence the nature of their education.

At the beginning of 1950, the administration of Assumption College invited the students and staff at Holy Names to transfer directly to their campus. Several explanations for the timing of the invitation were offered by the then president of Assumption,

Reverend J.H. O'Loane. A recent drive for funds had rendered the male college "under an obligation to introduce coeducation". [4] This obligation had arisen from "strong pressure" from Windsor families to allow their daughters to take advantage of the growing facilities at Assumption. In addition, Assumption could no longer spare those teachers who had been travelling to the Academy to conduct courses in Religious Knowledge and Philosophy. [5] Thus, the reasons for introducing coeducation at Assumption were as much financial as they were academic.

The expanding enrolment at Assumption encouraged the College's officials to obtain status as a self-contained University and to terminate affiliation with the University of Western Ontario. [6] On March 13, 1953, the Assumption College Act was passed in the Legislature and the institution was given the power to grant its own degrees. [7]

The new status of Assumption had direct consequences for the future direction of Holy Names. When the staff and students had commuted to Assumption, the relative autonomy of Holy Names as a distinct women's college remained intact. With the introduction of coeducation, however, the Sisters were confronted with the unpleasant possibility of being reduced to the role of overseers of a women's residence. [8] Sister Aloysius Mary, successor to Sister Mary Electa, discussed the consequences of the agreement in a letter to the Mother General of the Order. Sister Aloysius Mary wrote that

> Coeducation at Assumption is here to stay ! Our remaining here is a sacrifice of woman-

> power; our withdrawal would be a loss of prestige and probably some friends...Under the present conditions could not seculars do the work we are doing ? [9]

Clearly, Sister Aloysuis Mary recognized that Assumption would eventually carry out the educational needs of female students once performed exclusively by Holy Names. She was perceptive or sufficiently farsighted to see that the members of the order currently administering the College could move on to other projects. And, in fact, a decade later, the Sisters did relinquish control of the College.

The first year of coeducation passed remarkably smoothly although it did not result in fundamental change in the nature of women's education. Despite the presence of female students and staff, the essential separation of the sexes that had existed previously continued. The advent of coeducation did not mark the demise of the "paternalistic milieu" that characterized Assumption's safe, all male elite. [10] In fact, the presence of women on campus was perceived in terms of a pleasant distraction and not taken seriously by some of the male members of the institution. For example, the first year of coeducation at Assumption was recounted in the Ambassador Yearbook in playful tones, focusing on the benefits that men might enjoy from the presence of women on campus.

> Gradually the novelty wore off and everyone grew to accept the fact that girls were here to stay and perhaps a little reluctantly to admit that things weren't so bad after all. [11]

The sentiment that, despite women's admittance, "things weren't

so bad after all" signified that the status quo at the College remained after the introduction of coeducation.

The 1950 graduating class was comprised of 119 students, ninety-seven of whom received general Bachelor of Arts degrees. All ten of the women who graduated from Assumption through Holy Names, received this general degree. Among faculty as well, men greatly outnumbered women. Of the forty-eight member faculty, eighteen were priests, sixteen were laymen, five were laywomen and three were Sisters. [12] The Student's Administrative Council numbered thirteen students and one moderator. Two women sat on the council. One, Ann Morrison, was "Girl's Representative" and the other, Rene Rochon, was secretary. Student Council president, Jerome C. Smyth, marked the arrival of female students to Assumption in the following manner :

> Let me add a word in regards to those young ladies whose delicate footfalls have rung through our sacrosanct male domain. Your council rather expected problems in our first year of coeducation but met with a cooperation and a rapid spirit seldom encountered among male students. [13]

Had the inaugural year of coeducation at Assumption been greeted with an army of women challenging male privilege or their dominant position in student life, Smyth's comments might have been less congenial. The "sacrosanct male domain" was, in 1950, essentially unscathed.

In terms of their numbers and academic pursuits, women and men were essentially separated on the Assumption campus. The Ambassador Yearbook for the year 1952 provides a breakdown of the

number of men and women in each year of undergraduate studies as well those enrolled in graduate studies or as part-time students. After two years of coeducation at Assumption, male students still far outnumbered female students in each category except among part-time students. [14] Of the 122 students comprising the graduating class, the majority received their general arts degree, with six science majors and one honours philosophy graduate. Each of the three women who graduated earned a general arts degree.

In 1952 Assumption had forty-five faculty members, seven of whom were women. Twenty-two priests were on faculty along with seventeen laymen, four laywomen and three Sisters. With the exception of one Sister lecturing in the Science Department , the women were found exclusively in the Faculty of Arts. Of the female faculty only two enjoyed the rank of full professor. [15]

When women did break into traditionally male realms, either as students, faculty or club members, their presence was occasionally perceived as an amusing anomaly. For example, the 1952 report of the Biology Club reveals that the male members of the organization were not comfortable with the presence of female students.

> The Assumption College Biological Society is composed,in the main, of upperclassmen with at least a year's previous training in biology. This year, this once select group went democratic and for the first time since its inception admitted through its portals the strangest of all biological wonders..... women. [16]

In that year, only one woman belonged to this "select group",

however, her characterization as the "strangest of all biological wonders" may have meant that men at Assumption were uncomfortable with the presence of women on campus. That this woman stood out as an oddity within the club, by virtue solely of her gender, further signifies how a "separate and `different' education" subtly informed women's experience at Assumption. The perception of her presence is unmistakably characterized as somehow lowering the standards of this "select group". That one woman joined the Biology Club in this year underscored a degree of initiative on her part. The undue attention directed at her, nonetheless, may have discouraged other women from following her example.

The academic participation of women at Assumption did not change significantly from 1950 to 1955. [17] In each year men significantly outnumbered women at all levels of the institution. Women enrolled in the traditionally "female disciplines", and were overwhelmingly concentrated in the General Arts faculty. Although men were still in the majority in General Arts, women enrolled in the faculty would have been in the company of other women and therefore feelings of isolation may have been reduced.

In 1955, Holy Names entered into negotiations for the College to be officially incorporated into Assumption. The decision to do so had been made on the part of both the General Council of the order of the Holy Names and Assumption's administration. Father LeBel, then president of Assumption had petitioned the Sisters to build a new residence in order to accommodate the "unusually large number of applicants". [18] As

long as Holy Names remained officially independent from Assumption, the burden of securing funding for the undertaking remained with the congregation. Thus, Father LeBel requested that the Sisters build facilities adequate to accommodate at least one hundred students and to include a Department of Domestic Science and a Music School. In April 1956 the Council decided to have a new residence hall completed with the stipulation that Holy Names would then become an affiliated College of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Assumption University of Windsor (university status had been granted in April, 1956). In the following September ninety-seven women students were registered, thirty-six of whom were from out of town and thus required residence accommodations. Twenty-four of the students were housed in the temporary campus residence and the remaining twelve moved into an annexed apartment located on Kennedy Place.[19]

The "advent of femininity" at Assumption in 1950 had marked only the first of a number of changes at the institution. In 1955, a financial campaign was undertaken by the Basilisan Fathers in preparation for the expected flood of applicants. The objectives of the fundraising were to construct a new library, a university union and to enlarge the institution's heating system.[20]

In 1956 a number of new colleges were affiliated with Assumption, for example, Essex College, a non-denominational institution responsible for the Sciences, Business Administration and Nursing Education. This was followed, in 1957, by the

affiliation of Canterbury College, an Anglican College and Holy Redeemer College. [21]

Despite the significant physical changes that occurred at Assumption, women still occupied a separate sphere of activity and continued to be limited to their assigned role. In 1956, the Holy Names Undergraduate Association (H.N.U.A) was founded and became responsible for "all athletics, activities, and discipline for women at Assumption". [22] The importance of the H.N.U.A was highlighted in the 1957 Ambassador Yearbook under the following slogan : "That in a man's world, woman is not forgotten". [23] Assumption University, with its male to female ratio holding at six to one was in 1957, very much a "male world". While the number of men grew steadily from 466 in 1954 to 573 in 1957, women's enrolment was seriously lagging behind. While the number of women attending Assumption did increase during this period, from sixty students in 1954 to ninety students in 1957, they nevertheless remained very much a minority. [24] The marginal role of women is exemplified by the dedication of the 1957 Centennial edition of the Ambassador Yearbook to the "men of Assumption". [25] The implicit "separateness" of women at Assumption, often clearly demonstrated in the attitudes expressed towards their presence, ensured that women did not belong to the College in the same way as their male colleagues.

During the 1950's the extra-curricular activities of women at Assumption centred on organizations such as the H.N.U.A. Holy Names College itself assumed the role of "social convenor" for

the university. The Women's Auxiliary and the Women's Athletics Committee were also established during the late 1950's.[26] These groups provided some financial assistance for women's endeavours since these were not supported by the University. The common characteristic linking each of these women's organizations was the emphasis placed upon their ability to provide the social complement to the academic and competitive activities of the male students. As such, these groups acted as another source of women's "separateness" from the mainstream of activity, mostly male- dominated and controlled, on the campus.

The Women's Athletic Committee (W.A.C.) provided support for women's sporting events and established intermural programs. Its goal, "to present an opportunity to all women on campus of obtaining fellowship, goodwill and a competitive spirit", was concerned with producing well-rounded young women. Athletic Night, an annual event held specifically for women and sponsored by the W.A.C., involved a social gathering at Electa Hall and a series of athletic events for the women to engage in. The organization was concerned with promoting women's sports as they existed separately from men's. In promoting women's "fellowship, goodwill and competitive spirit", the W.A.C. encouraged female athletes to be, first and foremost, congenial women.

The staff and students at Holy Names College hosted theme dances and social teas throughout the 1950's and early 1960's, including the annual Holy Names Prom which was the highlight of the University's social calender. The profits from these

activities enabled the H.N.U.A. to offer a partial scholarship and to make contributions to the improvement of the conditions for women on campus. In 1956, the proceeds gathered by the H.N.U.A. went to aid the building of the new College, completed in 1959.[27]

That the female students at Assumption assumed a primarily social function clearly informed the objectives of the Women's Auxiliary, founded in 1956 and made up of women from the surrounding community. The primary function of the group was to "assist in the development of the Arts in the University and secondly to meet the needs of the women".[28] The group was organized into three chairs, each coordinating a different undertaking : the friends of the Library, the friends of the Nursery and the friends of Music.[29] While the activities of the group benefitted all students, its areas of interest were those which had become identified with women's sphere. The areas of concern of the Women's Auxiliary demonstrated a keen interest in the future development of the University. The fundamental nature of the Auxiliary, nevertheless, served to perpetuate the "separate and `different' education" received by Assumption women. It did not encourage women to enter traditionally male-dominated, and often more lucrative, professions, nor did it encourage the expansion of those faculties most closely identified with women, such as Nursing. The Auxiliary held no political power on the campus and thus could not serve as a pressure group for women's needs. Instead, the group was fairly

limited in terms of political influence and rather epitomized woman's stereotypical affinity for the liberal arts and social affairs.

The sources of women's implicit "separateness" at Assumption during the 1950's similarly shaped the experience of women at other universities. Anna Temple maintains, for example, that generally women "accepted their position, setting up their own networks of college activities and clubs and stringently adhered to the unwritten policy of separation." [30] At The University of British Columbia, like Assumption College, the admission of women "often hinged on the provision of separate learning and living space for female students". [31] In her study, Nicole Neatby concludes that coeducation "did not mean the integration of women into the student body." [32] The common theme of women's "separateness" on campus can also be found in the experience of American women. In the United States, Florence Howe has pointed out that, historically, the very notion of coeducation for women and men has been shrouded in a myth of presumed equality of experience.

> In mythical terms, coeducation opened doors to women. And so it did. But those doors were-and to a significant extent still are-different from those of men. [33]

That women tended to experience a "separate and `different' education" was not limited to Assumption College in Windsor but rather marked a common characteristic of women's experience at institutions of higher education in Canada and elsewhere.

A further source of women's separateness at Assumption,

aside from their physical, organizational and numerical isolation, was their academic experience. In the 1956-1957 academic year, the University was seriously considering the possibility of expanding the existing Engineering faculty. Two committees were established to develop plans for the envisioned construction of a $5,000,000 Engineering Building.[34] Responding to a survey which indicated that "engineers are more in demand than the supply can meet", the Assumption administration sought to keep pace with a changing society's needs.[35]

The perceived need to provide more facilities for the training of engineers was also encouraged by certain members of the Canadian business community. They too perceived that, at least for a portion of the male student body, the university was fast becoming a training ground for scientific and technological experts. Technological advancement was paralleled by the demand for such abilities in the industrial sector and a high degree of prestige and power. W.E. Phillips commented in 1958 that by training more engineers, for example, the university would fulfil "our responsibility to community and nation."[36] Phillips further maintained that

> if we followed popular demand, we would devote at once a large part of our available funds to the creation of new Engineering buildings and the addition of more Engineering staff.[37]

The perception of engineering as one of the most competitive disciplines also found its way onto the Assumption campus. In

the Ambassador Yearbook of 1957 the members of the Engineering Club were described in the following manner :

> In this age when our civilization is sustained by the ever increasing achievements of science, more and more young men are turning to engineering as a rewarding and infinitely interesting career.[38]

In the description, the engineering discipline is intimately linked with the potential to improve and sustain Canadian society. More significantly, however, engineers were described as exclusively male. This stereotypical description was symptomatic of contemporary values and attitudes on campus and in society. At this time, the Engineering faculty of Assumption was comprised exclusively of male students.[39]

The Assumption University statistics for 1956-1957 listing the majors of full-time students indicate that female students did not enter the Commerce program, nor the faculties of pure science, such as chemistry or biology, nor the applied sciences to the same extent as they did the General Arts program.[40] The majority of students in the laboratory assistant program were women. While the students in the laboratory assistant program did receive training in scientific experimentation and research, the calibre and intensity of instruction did not rival that afforded to pure science majors. These women were not being trained for positions of leadership and power but instead were being trained to assume a secondary role as support staff under the direction and supervision of a presumably male chemist or doctor. Thus, the nature of education received by these women

did not approach the level afforded to their predominantly male counterparts in the pure and applied sciences.

In 1956, six students, including two women, received their Bachelor of Science degree. By 1957, the total enrolment in science had risen to ninety-four students, fifteen of whom were women. Similarly in the Faculty of Commerce, women were a minority group. In 1955, the total enrolment in Commerce was eighteen male students. In the three consecutive years following 1955, the enrolment went from sixteen students in 1956, to nineteen in 1957 and twenty-three in 1958. In each of these years, only one woman was enrolled. [41] Heralded as the "liveliest" organization on campus, the Commerce club, despite the membership of two women, was responsible for the "major stag of the year". [42] Geared exclusively to men, the club's most prestigious event was not accessible even to its own female members.

The limited involvement of women in nontraditional fields at Assumption during this period parallels that experienced at other Canadian universities. Those few women who did enter fields such as engineering, science and commerce pursued their academic careers almost exclusively in the company of men. For example, Anne Rochon Ford concludes that at the University of Toronto, "in terms of the number of women enrolled at the University, women in nontraditional fields represented a very small percentage of the total." [43] In her study of the experience of women at McGill University, Margaret Gillett found that "predictably, women

encountered the greatest difficulties in the faculties representing traditional `male professions'." [44] Gillett further maintains that a significant number of women did not enter these faculties, or did so only on a small scale, because of the stereotypical myths surrounding such pursuits. According to the author

> The total engineering environment has been alien to the received idea of Woman. Engineering has been public, out-of doors, frequently concerned with massive construction projects... All this has been the antithesis of the typical female - private, indoors, domestic, personal, small, weak. [45]

Gillett's observations help to explain how and why women were excluded from nontraditional fields in the universities. At Assumption, women entered those disciplines that were deemed "socially acceptable" and as such, did not threaten to blur the clearly defined boundaries that separated male and female spheres.

The Nursing Education Program, established in 1955, and the Household Science program, carried over from Holy Names, at Assumption College marked the institution's accommodation to women. These programs, unlike engineering or commerce, were perfectly suited to the "received idea of woman". They were designed to be of interest to her and to professionalize her role as nurturer.

In the middle of the nineteenth century in Canada, lay nurses were not held in the same high esteem as were the nursing religious. The poor and destitute were the patrons of hospitals

and the lay nurses who worked in them were perceived as servants who could not find respectable employment elsewhere. [46] In the United States, similarly, hospital nursing represented to many a "realm of besotted ignorance". [47] The organization of training schools for nurses represented an attempt to raise their status as professional care-givers.

By the latter part of the century, a campaign to improve the respectability of nursing began to have an impact in Canada. The first successful training school for nurses was established in St. Catharines in 1874. [48] The young trainees, however, often represented a cheap labour pool for the hospitals. The dependence on nursing students to provide essentially domestic services ensured that meaningful changes in their status were slow to appear.

Several attempts were made by nurses to maintain their position as midwives. For example, the Victorian Order of Nurses (VON) was formed in 1897 with the intention of expanding the level of expertise and allowing some of their members to act as midwives. This attempt, however, was vehemently opposed by the medical profession and never came to fruition. [49] The VON became, nevertheless, a model national public health nursing service, training its members to call on patients in their homes.

Doctors became increasingly hostile when nursing education seemed to take "a professional turn". [50] In the United States, the demands for nursing - and female - autonomy alarmed both attending physicians and hospital board members. This hostility

accounted, in part, for the initial hesitancy in establishing training schools for nurses.[51]

In the early part of the twentieth century, the Canadian National Association of Trained Nurses, formed originally to affiliate with the International Council of Nurses in 1897, struggled to improve working conditions for nurses and to raise such issues as the need for registration.[52] Members of the nursing profession in Canada believed that registration would attest to their training and skill, thus legitimizing themselves in the eyes of both the public and other professionals.

The Spanish influenza epidemic of 1918-19 that took the lives of 50,000 Canadians resulted in a greater recognition of the nursing profession. With a new degree of respect and acceptance, nurses engaged in an intense campaign to control their profession. The first university degree program in nursing in Canada, and in the entire British Empire, was established in 1919 at the University of British Columbia.[53] McGill and Toronto followed in 1920 in a bid to satisfy an increasing need for nursing teachers, administrators and public health nurses. Some opposition to these developments was lodged by those within the profession who feared preferential treatment for university-trained nurses. For example, doctors in particular opposed higher education for nurses. Maintaining, for example, that two years of training was sufficient and that any extensive nursing education would result in the "loss of their usefulness", doctors in Canada betrayed a concern for their own power and position in

the hospital hierarchy.[54]

Into the 1930's, the importance of training schools for nurses in Canada continued to center on their capacity to provide cheap labour for hospitals. Most student nurses worked long hours, up to twelve per day, and were expected to attend lectures as part of their routine. In addition, the students had to perform heavy housekeeping duties. They were severely underpaid and were forced to compete with untrained women who were willing to provide similar services for lower wages. During the decade, nurses in Canada turned to strike action to ensure improved working conditions and to gain a higher degree of professional recognition and respect.[55] Thus, the nursing profession in Canada has, from its inception, struggled to overcome its lack of professional status and power.

In her study of the experience of women at the University of Toronto from 1939 to 1949, Nancy Kiefer concludes that the Second World War had the greatest impact on the nursing program.[56] Here, young women in the nursing program were urged to finish their schooling quickly because they offered "needed service in time of emergency".[57] During the duration of the war, the nursing profession and those who trained under it enjoyed a significant improvement in their status and recognition. At the end of the war, however, this new found degree of recognition was not maintained because the critical need for nursing services waned. Nevertheless, the nursing program's alignment with the university in general has become a crucial one. In its capacity

to project a "lure of professionalism", and the status that accompanies it, the university setting has proven to be critical to the nursing profession. [58]

The Nursing Education program, established at Assumption in 1955, represented the largest science area in which women enrolled. In that year, twenty students, all of whom were women, enrolled in either the basic undergraduate degree program, the degree program for registered nurses or the diploma course in nursing for regular nurses. [59] The majority of students, eleven in total, enrolled in the diploma course which catered to those nurses who were already working in the field but wished to upgrade their skills. From its inception, however, the program was marginalized and did not receive the same institutional attention as that paid to the professional male schools, such as engineering. Instead of providing a facility similar to that afforded to the engineering faculty, the administration housed the Nursing Education in a former family residence close to the university. In her report to the President in 1956, Florence Roach, Dean of Nursing noted that the faculty housing served only their "present needs" with little room for development and expansion. [60]

The limited attention given to the Nursing Education program at this time seriously undermined the profession's attempt, as a whole, to benefit from its association with the university. Associated with the Metropolitan Hospital, the school was administered and funded internally by the hospital, not, as would

be the preferred situation, by the university. By 1952, the demonstration school had run out of the necessary funds to ensure its continuation.[61] Helen Russell, Honourary Adviser in Nursing to the Canadian Red Cross Society and instrumental in establishing the demonstration school in Windsor, wrote in 1951 that

> The junior school of which I am speaking may remain on the hospital grounds, as at present, but financially and administratively, it should be independent of the hospital...Secondly, the resources for nursing education must include the university school.[62]

The Assumption administration, acting in accordance with the conventions of the "separate and `different' education " ideology, provided only the minimum requirements for the Nursing faculty. In doing so, and in light of an insistence on the importance of the university's cooperation in training future nurses from various sources closely aligned with the profession, the University administration's policy served only to marginalize the department. Although the Nursing Education program would eventually garner enough attention to be housed in larger quarters on campus, its initial separation both physically and in terms of its perceived importance from the rest of campus, demonstrated the negative ramifications of the perception of woman's separate sphere.

Like Nursing, Home Economics courses offered at Assumption represented an academic offering aimed specifically at women. In the 1930's, courses in Home Economics had been taught by the Sisters of the Holy Names at both Holy Names College and St.

Mary's Academy. By 1957, plans to establish a Home Economics Department within the newly organized University of Windsor had begun. At this time, courses received accreditation through the University of Western Ontario.

From its inception, however, the Home Economic discipline struggled to become an accepted academic undertaking. In the United States, for example, the program gained, after losing ground in the late nineteenth century, a solid place as an academic offering in the 1900's.[63] Dean Marion Talbot, founder of the program at Chicago, predicted in 1903 that

> as soon as Home Economics can be developed so as to have real educational as well as practical value, it will be given a place among the new social sciences as honorable as that which Political Economy or the Science of Government occupies.[64]

A conscious effort to provide "real educational as well as practical value" in Home Economics encouraged educators to develop a scientific basis to the program. While the subject was unified by "the focus on the home", it attempted to integrate a knowledge of chemistry and economics.[65] Despite the controversy over its educational value, training in Home Economics provided important sources of female employment in the United States in the early and mid-nineteen century.

> During World War I graduates of advanced programs rose in the labour force. In this era of increasing professionalism, home economics provided a new occupational specialty for high school teachers, urban social workers, and college professors.[66]

In Canada, Home Economics was widely taught to junior and senior high school students and groups of adult women. By the

late 1930's, university degree programs were well established in ten institutions. A degree course began at the University of Toronto in 1902. The MacDonald Institute in Guelph, Ontario and MacDonald College in Ste. Anne de Bellevue had, by 1903, begun to offer advanced classes in domestic science.[67] The University of Manitoba and McGill offered degree courses in 1915. Similarly, Alberta offered Home Economics courses in 1918. By 1928, five universities, namely Mount Allison, Acadia, St. Francis Xavier, Mount St. Vincent and Saskatchewan offered degree courses in Home Economics. Brescia College at the University of Western Ontario followed with a degree course in 1938. [68] Many of the new university programs in Home Economics were founded at this time to provide teachers for a growing number of new courses that were beginning to become a part of the course offerings at the lower schools. [69] The academic calibre of the program, while often a matter of debate by critics, certainly benefitted from its association with the university. At McGill University, for example, the School of Household Science grew "academically stronger" over the years. In 1934, the School became an integral part of the Faculty of Agricultural and, in 1944, changed its degree to Bachelor of Science (Home Economics). [70]

Organizations chiefly residing outside the university setting also concerned themselves with the educational aspects of Home Economics. The Canadian Home Economics Association, founded in 1937, set up an Educational Committee to oversee the progression and growth of Home Economics training. An early

report of the Committee, published in 1945, recommended that teachers needed better training, their work had to reach more students and that there was a need for the use of a standardized textbook in the Canadian Home Economic classroom. [71]

During the late 1940's and early 1950's, the Home Economics discipline concerned educators, the Canadian Home Economics Association and the members of a Royal Commission. Representatives from these groups were concerned with establishing and maintaining a high calibre of instruction. A common theme running through the observations and recommendations made about Home Economics was the profession's ability to provide suitable jobs for Canadian women outside the home. Second, the need for studies in Home Economics at the Graduate level in Canada's universities was stressed as a desirable goal.

In the late 1940's, Grace Duggan, Associate Professor in the School of Household Economics, University of Alberta, conducted a detailed analysis of the field of Home Economics education. Duggan's report, completed in 1950, identified a significant shift in the main reason that young women were studying Home Economics. Only secondarily as a preparation for marriage, the study of Home Economics, Duggan found, was undertaken "primarily to receive training which they hope will allow them to earn a living in a woman's profession". [72] Home Economics was thus duly recognized as a source of appropriate employment for Canadian women. Not only did the profession itself present opportunities for women's work, it gave them the necessary

training to enter those occupations that existed for women at this time.

The importance placed on education and training in Duggan's report was reiterated in the Royal Commission on the National Development in Arts, Letters and Sciences held in 1950. In a brief on the state of Home Economics training, the Commission recommended that grants be made available for graduate study and for "the establishment and expansion of graduate schools in Canada".[73] Clearly, the findings of the Commission gave full support to the establishment of graduate programs in Home Economics. The members of the Commission recognized that such programs in Canada's universities would enrich the discipline. In turn, the existence of graduate programs would provide opportunities for governmental assistance and financial support.

The viability of a Department of Home Economics at the University of Windsor did become a matter of some debate. In 1959, Reverend N.J. Ruth, Dean of Arts and Sciences at Windsor, requested the guidance of Charlotte S. Black, Director of the School of Household Science at the University of British Columbia, regarding the viability of starting a Home Economics program at Windsor. Similarly, questionnaires were sent to the Heads of various Department and Schools of Home Economics at other Canadian universities. The questions contained in the survey dealt with a number of issues : was there a demand for a Home Economics program in general ? Were a sufficient number of universities offering these courses already? Did the Home

Economics program itself belong in the university or was it better suited to technical institutions ? In his letter to Charlotte Black, Reverend Ruth appeared unsure of the best direction for the University of Windsor to take in regards to the establishment of a Home Economics program.

> The decision must be made soon, whether to splurge on facilities and staff and retain both courses, Honours and General, or to drop the Honours course and retain the General or drop them both entirely. [74]

Despite Reverend Ruth's uncertainties, the responses indicated that "although in general the enrolment was decreasing, the demand for such graduates in industry and teaching was increasing". [75] On May 25, 1960, the Senate of the University of Windsor carried a motion to establish a general program in Home Economics to be offered at the University. The following courses constituted the Department of Home Economics at this time : Textiles and Clothing, Home Management, Family Relations, Foods, Nutrition, Experimental Cookery and a seminar in Home Economics.

The program underwent a number of significant changes after its establishment. Enrolment figures rose from twenty-five students in 1960 - 61, to seventy in 1961 - 62. Between 1962 and 1964, three new staff members joined the program. In 1965, a new course in Commercial Patterns and Tailoring was added. On November 9, 1967, it was recommended to the Senate that the rank of Department in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences be given to Home Economics. It was so moved and carried by the Senate in

January, 1968. Since enrolment was continually increasing, additional laboratory space, meeting rooms and offices were requested. Although renovations were made to the facilities, they were not adequate to satisfy the growing enrolment.

Despite the presence of some beneficial results for women's work, concerned feminist educators often criticised Home Economics education, focusing on the fact that it "emphasized women's domestic role to the exclusion of all others". [76] Regardless of the important contributions of innovative educators in the field who "stressed its social and scientific implications", Home Economics, they argued, had the potential to "draw women students away from other disciplines" thereby threatening the process of "attaining educational and intellectual equality." [77] While the attempt to develop Home Economics into a rigorous, scientifically-based discipline broadened its thrust and objectives, its essential purpose was perceived as a traditional one that threatened to continue women's "separate and `different' education".

At Assumption University, a gender barrier remained in place and it was male students who benefitted from those academic pursuits that were becoming increasingly linked with power and prestige. Although a new perception of the university's role was emerging in the 1950's, it did not include the abandonment of women's implicit segregation. In 1951 the federal Royal Commission on National Development in Arts, Letters and Sciences concluded that the universities had the potential to become a

"recruiting ground" for national service. The importance of scientific research and its ability to protect and to improve the material well-being of Canada was recognized, and the federal government announced that it would supply direct grants to non-denomination universities. [78] A marked increase in student enrolment at both the elementary and secondary school levels, a result of the post-war "baby boom", alerted officials to the need to improve and expand the universities and colleges. [79] The very existence of the 1956 Conference on the Crisis in Canadian Universities exemplified the growing concern over the need to expand existing facilities to match the expected increase on University enrolment. [80] A desperate need for technological advancement, cultivated in part by the attitudes of the Cold War, made the country's universities and colleges responsible for the training of scientists, engineers and technicians to compete on the international market. [81] At Assumption University, this training was limited to male -dominated disciplines. During this period, women were not entering the science disciplines, nor engineering, to the same extent that men were. Any perceived reward that resulted from entering a program in the pure and applied sciences during this period, benefitted men much more than women.

The Assumption administration had to respond to the impending demographic crisis that was to hit Canada's universities in the late 1950's. Between 1950 and 1960, Assumption's student body had grown significantly, and by 1962,

the Basilian Fathers had exhausted their funds and credit. The government - supported Essex College was forced into an increasing annual deficit from 1958 to 1962 trying to cope with expansion. [82] The Ontario Government's Committee on University Affairs invited Assumption to help solve the higher education problem in Ontario by tripling its enrolment within three years. [83] The financial statement of 1960-1961 clearly showed, however, that the University had already over- extended its budget. University College had a deficit of $109,784 while Essex College had a deficit of $96,435. [84] The predicted annual deficit limited the University's ability to expand. According to policy, only those universities with Boards of Directors representing the public at large could receive provincial funding. In order to qualify for the provincial funding necessary to meet the growing needs of higher education in Essex county, Assumption University would have to become a public institution, independent of the Basilian Fathers. An agreement to that effect was reached in 1961, and in 1964, Assumption University was officially designated the University of Windsor. [85] Despite the official compliance with the policies of the Ontario government, the education received at Assumption kept its Christian foundations, religion courses continued to be offered and the teaching and administrative services of members of the Basilian order were retained. [86]

By 1962, the Sisters at Holy Names were also experiencing the financial burdens that accompanied demographic growth and a

lack of adequate funding. Their new college, built in 1958, was too small to house the increasing number of resident students registering at the University. [87] In that same year, the General Council of the Order and a panel of consultants from the Windsor area studied the feasibility of expanding the facilities. The study concluded that in order to expand the College's facilities and to "raise our status as a College", the Sisters would require at least $1,000,000. [88] In 1962, the General Council of the Order entered into negotiations with Father LeBel to relinquish its control of Holy Names College. The departure of the Sisters of the Holy Names marked the end of an era at Assumption. In tribute to the first Dean of Holy Names College, the building was renamed Electa Hall. The order remained active at St. Mary's Academy, but the College had become, as Sister Aloysuis Mary had predicted some ten years earlier, a women's residence.

Despite the significant institutional changes that occurred at Assumption, the experience of women remained distinct from that of men. At the October 1964 graduation ceremonies, for example, thirty-three women received degrees, thirty-one of them a general Bachelor of Arts. One student received a Master of Arts in Psychology, and another a Bachelor of Applied Science in Electrical Engineering. [89] Of the ninety-three male graduates, fifty-four received their Bachelor of Arts. Unlike the women, however, the remaining male graduates could be found in a host of other areas, such as engineering, chemistry, commerce and

science. [90] Throughout the 1950's and early 1960's, women continued to be outnumbered by men, and they did not enter those faculties , including pure and applied science and business, which were being touted as the way of the future. The academic and extracurricular activities of women at Assumption were dictated by an ideology of "difference". Held back by their small numbers, a lack of administrative attention and financial support, and an institutionally and socially engrained attitude that characterized coeds as wives and mothers "in waiting", women at Assumption made little progress towards academic equality. [91]

Endnotes to Chapter Two

1. Ramsay Thompson, " The Controversy Over the Admission of Women to University College," p. 43.

2. L`Esperance, The Widening Sphere, p. 6.

3. Al Roach, All our Memories II: A Second Affectionate Remembrance of All Our Yesterdays in This Windsor - Essex County Area (Windsor: Essex Historical Association, 1980), p. 75.

4. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 240.

5. Ibid., p. 240.

6. Report of the President, 1954-1955, (Windsor: Assumption University), p. 2.

7. Ibid., p. 2.

8. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 242.

9. Ibid., p. 242.

10. The phrase "paternalistic milieu" is employed by Lynn Gordon, "Coeducation on Two Campuses," in Woman's Being, Woman's Place, ed. Mary Kelly, to signify an environment on campus in which, despite the pretence of coeducation, men and women do not necessarily receive an equal education.

11. Ambassador Yearbook, 1951, p. 90.

12. Ibid., p. 6-18.

13. Ibid., p. 14.

14. Ambassador Yearbook, 1953, p. 14.

15. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

16. Ibid., p. 22.

17. For the years running from 1952 until 1956, the total number of male to female graduates was as follows : 73 to 9, 32 to 8, 53 to 11, 45 to 2.

18. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 249.

19. Ibid., p. 249.

20. Report of the President, 1956-1957, pp. 2-3.

21. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

22. Ambassador Yearbook, 1957, p. 10.

23. Ibid., p. 10.

24. Report of the President, 1956-1957, p. 47.

25. Ambassador Yearbook, 1957, p. 10.

26. Report of the President, 1956-1957, p. 23.

27. Ibid., p. 23.

28. Report of the President, 1957, p. 42.

29. Ibid., p. 42.

30. Temple, "The Development of Higher Education for Women," p. 183.

31. Stewart, " The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia," p. 1.

32. Neatby, "Women at Queen's in the 1920's," p. 44.

33. Howe, Myths of Coeducation, p. 209.

34. Report of the President, 1956-1957, pp. 7-9.

35. Ibid., p. 17.

36. W.E. Phillips, "From the Board Room Window" in The University and Business, ed. Douglas Grant (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), p. 500.

37. Ibid., p. 500.

38. Ambassador Yearbook, 1957, p. 23.

39. Report of the President, 1956-1957, p. 66a.

40. Ibid. , p. 66a. The total number of male and female students enrolled in the Bachelor of Commerce program in 1956 were 136 and 3 respectively. Among Science majors, 170 were men and 34 women, while there were no women in engineering, chemistry or physics.

41. Ambassador Yearbook, 1955, 1956, 1957.

42. Ibid., 1955, p. 20.

43. Anne Rochon Ford, A Path Not Strewn With Roses: One Hundred Years of Women at the University of Toronto, 1884-1984,(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 50.

44. Margaret Gillett, We Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill (Montreal: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981), p. 279.

45. Ibid., p. 317.

46. Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History, p. 131.

47. Charles E. Rosenburg, The Care of Strangers: The Rise of America's Hospital System (New York: Basic Books, Inc. Publications, 1987), p. 212.

48. Judi Coburn " `I See and am Silent' : A Short History of Nursing in Ontario," Women At Work - Ontario, 1850-1930, eds. Janice Acton, Penny Goldsmith and Bonnie Shepard (Toronto : Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1974), p. 136.

49. Prentice et. al., Canadian Women - A History, p. 131.

50. Ibid., p. 131.

51. Rosenburg, The Care of Strangers, pp. 219-220.

52. Coburn, "I See and am Silent," in Women At Work, p. 136.

53. Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History, p. 225.

54. Ibid. , p. 226.

55. Ibid., p. 232.

56. Kiefer,"The Impact of the Second World War on Female Students at the University of Toronto, 1939-1949," p. 14.

57. Ibid., p. 14.

58. Coburn, "I See and am Silent'" in Women at Work, p. 128.

59. Report to the President, 1955-1956, p. 46.

60. Ibid., p. 43.

61. Helen M. Carpenter, A Divine Discontent: Edith Kathleen Russell - Reforming Educator (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), p. 49.

62. Ibid., p. 42.

63. Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women, p. 85.

64. Ibid., p. 85.

65. Ibid., p. 87.

66. Ibid., p. 86.

67. Alison Prentice et al., Canadian Women: A History, p. 157.

68. Norma Bannerman, Shirley Rebus and Arlene Smith, eds., We Are Tommorrow's Past: History of the Canadian Home Economics Association (Ottawa: Canadian Home Economics Association, 1989) p. 2.

69. Gillett, We Walked Very Warily, p. 347.

70. Ibid., p. 351.

71. Bannerman, Rebus, and Smith, We Are Tomorrow's Past, p. 42.

72. Ibid., p.42.

73. Ibid., p. 42.

74. Linda Brefka, Suzanne Rousseau and Doreen Bauld, "Home Economics at the University of Windsor" (Pamphlet prepared by the Home Economics Department, University of Windsor, 1987), p. 6.

75. Ibid., p. 2.

76. Ibid., p. 158.

77. Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women, p. 87.

78. Paul Axelrod, "Service or Captivity ? Business - University Relations in the Twentieth Century" in Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twentieth-Century, eds. William Neilson and Chad Gaffield (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1986), p. 46.

79. Paul Axelrod, Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), p. 34

80. Paul Axelrod, "Service or Captivity," in Universities in Crisis, p. 46.

81. Ibid., pp. 26-47.

82. Report of the President, 1962-1963, p.4.

83. Ibid., p. 5.

84. Ibid., p. 5.

85. Report of the President, 1965-1966, p. 20.

86. Ibid., p. 5.

87. Batte, Rooted in Hope, p. 340.

88. Ibid., p. 340.

89. Ambassador Yearbook, 1964, p. 12.

90. Ibid., p. 12.

91. Victoria Bissell Brown, "The Fear of Feminization: Los Angeles High Schools in the Progressive Era", Feminist Studies 16, 3 (Fall 1990) : 493. In characterizing the experience of women in institutes of higher learning in America during 1880 to 1910, Bissell Brown concludes similarly that " from the very beginning, coeducation at the college level carried explicit contingencies - that female students not threaten men's dominance in the classroom or on campus and that grads use their college education to be better wives and mothers..."

Chapter Three

"Pulling Away From Its Old Moorings" ?

The 1960's and the Transformation of the University of Windsor

The decade of the sixties at the University of Windsor was a complex one in which the existence of gender assumptions and barriers influencing the nature and scope of women's experience coexisted with an new age of "student power". At the University of Windsor and at universities across the country, "students demonstrated for more active involvement in the university community and for the recognition of student's rights." [1] An explosion of new construction, the marked increase in student enrolment, and the emergence of a new student-centred atmosphere occurred during this decade. But, the rapid changes taking place at the University were accompanied by a new set of institutional "growing pains". Paul Gilmor, Dean of Men, observed in 1963 that

> as the University pulls away from its old moorings and as changes characteristic of such a metamorphosis take place, it creates new problems, new needs, new visions and new tensions. [2]

The position of women within this institutional metamorphosis

constituted, as never before, a source of these "new needs" and "new tensions". Women themselves reached an unprecedented awareness of the quality of their experience on campus and began to organize for its enhancement. The concept of a "separate and `different' education" that had previously influenced women's education seemed increasingly out of step with the University's growth and modernization. Despite the rhetoric of progress that was espoused by the University's administration, by and large the nature of women's experience continued to be limited by the societal and institutional perceptions of their proper role. The lack of an organized response on the part of the University to the sources of women's implicit "separateness" continued to undermine their bid for academic equality. Although the decade was ostensibly a time of liberation and progress on campuses across Canada and the United States, the entrenched remnants of "a separate and `different' education" continued to inform women's experience.

The impetus for the University to instigate a program of change and expansion came from a number of sources, both internal and external. One of the most significant factors was the rapid growth in student enrolment during the 1960's. Between the 1961-1962 term and the 1969-1970 term, the total number of students more than tripled, from 3307 to 11, 741. [3] Throughout the decade, moreover, there continued to be more male than female students. In 1961-62, men outnumbered women at Windsor by a ratio of 3 : 1. By 1969, the ratio of men to women at Windsor

had shrunk to approximately 2 : 1.[4] Despite the significant numerical disparity between male and female students, the overall number of students of both sexes who were attending the University grew at an astounding rate. This increase resulted in a number of changes which demanded the response of the University's administration.

The most obvious response by the administration to the increased student body was the physical expansion of the facility. In 1963, a new wing was added onto Electa Hall in an effort to encourage women to live on-campus. By 1966, four million dollars was invested in new construction at the University. A new wing was added onto Windsor Hall and the University purchased a Loblaw's store and converted it into a Fine Arts Building. According to an Office of Information Services memo, issued on December 16, 1968, plans were underway at that time to rally public support for a $64, 000,000 building project "to enable the University of Windsor to accommodate enrolment projections".[5] The building project was to include sixteen new buildings for teaching and research, a new university library extension, five new buildings for student housing, dining facilities, and two university service buildings. In 1968 seven of these projects were under construction : a new Law building, an academic auditorium, a teaching wing added to Windsor Hall, a 350 bed women's residence (which became Sir Wilfrid Laurier Hall), a communications centre, a new library extension and the addition of several residence floors to Cody Hall.[6] A similar

memo released by the office of Information Services on March 31, 1969 revealed that this mammoth expansion project was to be approached in two stages, according to priority. Approved by the Senate in May, 1967 and the Board of Governors by June of that same year, the building priorities for the period of 1967 to 1972 fell into two groups. The first priority was the construction of the new Law School, new classrooms and the library extension. Second in line for attention went to the building of the new residences and food services areas, specifically Laurier and Vanier Halls. [7]

The significant changes taking place at the rest of the University were slowly reflected at the administrative level. Although the Basilians and the Sisters of the Holy Names had lost official control of the University in 1963, secularization of Windsor did not readily occur. Even two years after the agreement with the provincial government to relinquish control of the University by the Basilians, an "ecclesiastical or clerical element" remained. [8] Many of the teachers were Basilians and a number of the students were seminarians and nuns. The Basilians continued to fill administrative offices. [9] Their presence had direct consequences for women at the institution. In her recollections of Assumption University, Dr. Lois Smedick, currently Dean of Graduate Studies at the University of Windsor maintains that

> One has to say that that [strong Basilian presence] did impose a certain kind of restraint because traditionally the Church has not been at the fore-front in this whole business of women taking on

a different role in society...so that was a factor.[10] The presence of Catholic educators at Windsor into the 1960's may have accounted for the continued attachment to the ideology of "separateness" which influenced women's education.

The Basilians were continuing to exercise their influence on an increasingly cosmopolitan campus. In 1956, the vast majority of students were Roman Catholic. Other Christian denominations, such as United, Anglican, Presbyterian and Lutheran had only a small representation.[11] By 1963, a number of denominations not previously represented had entered the statistics. While Roman Catholics still dominated, Baptists, Mennonites, Pentecostals and Greek Catholics entered the ranks in increasing numbers. The representation of students of various Christian denominations continued in the 1967-1968 academic year. Although Roman Catholicism dominated amongst the Christian denominations, those of the United, Anglican and Presbyterian Church were also represented. A host of other religions, however, were also listed by students at Windsor. Buddhism, Hinduism and Judaism, among others, were declared by a number of women and men attending the University.[12] Despite the considerable Catholic presence in the teaching and administrative ranks, the campus was attracting students of other denominations and different religious traditions. Their attendance at Windsor was clearly accepted and signified the increasing diversity of the student body's religious and cultural backgrounds.

As the number of students attending the University of

Windsor from various religious backgrounds increased during the 1960's, so too did those who originated from outside Essex county. From 1958 until 1968, Windsor-based students had been in the majority. During this period, however, the number of students from outside southern and northern Ontario, from other provinces, the United States and other countries, gradually increased. In particular, international students registered at the University of Windsor in increasing numbers. In the 1956-1957 school term, a total of 43 students arrived from outside of Canada. By 1968, this number had risen to 116.

During the 1960's the increasingly diverse backgrounds of students testified to an increasingly cosmopolitan atmosphere on campus. As the institution struggled to keep pace with the needs of its growing student body, it created a new Student Affairs office and a series of departments such as those responsible for student housing, counselling, food, and financial services. The rapid demographic growth and the increasingly cosmopolitan nature of the campus was paralleled by a new student-centred atmosphere that had not been evident in previous years.

The changing nature of women's education at the University was clearly reflected in the new student-centred atmosphere promoted by the administration. In February 1963, Evelyn McLean, the new Assistant Director of Student Affairs (Women) and a part-time lecturer in Fine Arts, began a reorientation of the position that had been previously occupied by a Sister of the Holy Names. McLean suggested that the women enrolled in all disciplines

should be encouraged to organize joint activities in order to foster a deeper understanding of different disciplines at the University of Windsor. In 1963, a counselling program for students, both male and female, was instituted. Both Evelyn McLean and Paul Gilmor reported that students summoned to their offices because of poor academic records were "eager to discuss personal problems".[13]

In her 1964-1965 report to the president, McLean continued to encourage women to challenge the purpose of their own educational goals and to improve the quality of them. The Dean had, according to her report, conducted interviews with female students, "particularly those in their final year at the University".[14] Based upon these interviews, the Dean concluded that "very few of our coeds have been truly educated : that is, they have failed to understand the integration of living and learning."[15] McLean went on to point out that

> It is in their graduating year that most young women stop to wonder what they are suited for in the area of productive employment, and it is with this in mind that I have been working with a group of interested students who see the need for group exposure to influential personalities.[16]

At this time, McLean expressed interest in organizing a symposium on vocations for women in Canada. The purpose in doing so, according to McLean, was to broaden the employment opportunities of Windsor's female graduates. In particular, McLean seemed interested in encouraging young women to enter non-traditional occupations. She noted that

> Such a symposium would serve to enlighten those students who do not seek a career in teaching or library work, the roles for which women have been traditionally prepared but which do not necessarily exploit their talents.[17]

McLean's sensitivity to the needs of women at the University clearly informed her attempts to increase their employment choices. The confidence McLean expressed in the diversity of women's interests and abilities, regardless of society's expectations of them, made her voice a particularly significant one for women at the University of Windsor during the 1960's and 1970's.[18]

Were the revolutionary changes detailed in the official statements reflected at all levels of the institution ? Certainly, the small number of women in the faculty was not perceived as out of step with the atmosphere of change and improvement. In 1964, the institution was comprised of twenty-three faculties with a total teaching staff of 177, of whom 125 were laymen and 35 were priests. Only seventeen women taught at the University in 1964 ; three of whom were religious. There were fourteen faculties with no women on staff, representing over half of the total at the University.[19] In 1965, two new faculties were introduced : the School of Physical Education and the Department of Engineering Materials. In this year, 188 professors were employed : 131 laymen, 37 priests, 17 laywomen and three religious. A total of 15 faculties had no women on staff.

The slow progress of women at the teaching level at Windsor was

paralleled at other universities. [20] The underrepresentation of women at the faculty level at Windsor, and at other institutions during the 1960's, served to exclude them from positions of academic authority and denied female students the exposure to positive role models. But the relatively small size of the University environment at Windsor in the early years of the decade may have worked to "counteract to a degree the fact of underrepresentation of women". [21] Dean Smedick maintains that before the rapid expansion of the University in the later 1960's, all members, female and male, had a greater opportunity to become involved in the political life of the institution. The smaller size of the institution lent itself much more readily to a sense of cohesiveness and community that was difficult to recapture as the University rapidly expanded. In this way, women were better able to " participate politically" in the life of the campus. [22] With the rapid expansion of the University and the lessons of the contemporary women's movement, however, women at the University became aware of the potential of "tokenism" as a possible, albeit unwanted, motivation for their inclusion. [23]

The involvement of women at the level of student government, like the faculty level, was also curtailed by gender barriers during the 1960's. In her official report to the President in 1960, Sister Mary Delores (predecessor of Evelyn McLean) pointed out that, for the first time in the history of the University, women were candidates for Student Council president. [24] Although a woman was not elected to the position, the official

perception of the event's significance was not diminished. Sister Delores remarked that

> The women students feel that the 1961 elections mark a significant milestone in the path of progress for Assumption University. No longer are the women attending a University for men but have come unto their own as coeds on a coed campus. [25]

That an influential member of the administration maintained that Assumption was no longer a "University for men" gave the unmistakable impression that women were gaining a degree of power on the campus. However, in 1964, the University Council for Women was abolished in the second semester by the Student's Administrative Council. [26] Initially, women at Windsor responded negatively to the actions of the S.A.C. [27] Evelyn McLean maintained, however, that the women's feelings of "suppression" soon faded as they themselves re-evaluated their position on the Council.

> They (women student leaders) realized that the University Council for Women President's ex officio membership on the S.A.C. was not necessarily reasonable, and that "a woman's voice in council" had relatively little value if that woman was incapable of making positive contributions to the overall student program. [28]

McLean pointed out that the Women's Council, which had devoted itself almost entirely to "the sponsoring of round-about dances", was now forced to "turn towards more mature and meaningful interests". [29] But the supportive and optimistic advice of the Dean of Women had not yet filtered down to the students a year later. In the Ambassador Yearbook of 1966, the reorganized University Council of Women stated that its purpose was to "co-

ordinate activities for women throughout the year".[30] The activities sponsored by the Council in this year and given attention in the Yearbook were unchanged : a Sadie Hawkins Dance and the traditional Children's Christmas Party. The Women's Council, with its separate mandate from the S.A.C. and its association with social rather than academic, political, or administrative concerns, acted as a further source of women's separateness at Windsor. During this period, the one woman who sat on the S.A.C. held the traditionally female position of Recording Secretary. The exclusion of women from powerful positions on the S.A.C. and their relegation to less meaningful duties within student government during the 1960's, rendered impossible the ability to make their voices and concerns heard to the same extent as the men.[31]

Throughout the 1960's a high profile woman, Evelyn McLean, made some attempts to encourage the women of the University of Windsor to integrate themselves into, and to become a more powerful part of, the mainstream of campus life. Reports about the growth and expansion that characterized the institution during this period leaves the impression that every segment of its population benefitted from the improved conditions. But, the experience of women at both levels of faculty and students demonstrates a contradictory experience. The period, for example, did not include the entrance of female students into non-traditional disciplines. At the level of graduate studies, women continued to be in the minority. After a decade of

coeducation, women continued to cluster in the non-professional disciplines and were underrepresented in the PhD. and Masters programs.

From 1964 until 1969, the Faculty of Graduate Studies enjoyed a continual increase in its student enrolment. In 1964, a total of sixty-two students were registered. By the 1969 academic year, the total number of students had grown to number 129. Throughout this period there were five post-graduate degree programs offered by the Faculty of Graduate Studies : Doctor of Philosophy, Master Of Arts, Master of Business Administration and Master of Applied Science. [32] Over the five year period, men consistently outnumbered women at the Graduate level (Appendix I). Not until the 1968-69 academic year would a woman earn a Ph.D. In that year, a single woman earned her Doctorate in Psychology. The majority of women received their Master Of Arts degree - a total of forty-six women. This numerical disparity is explained, in part, by the fact that aside from psychology, no other department in the social sciences or humanities, the faculties which attracted the majority of women at Windsor, offered a doctoral degree program.

At the University of Windsor, women were not pursuing their education at the graduate level in the same proportion to the overall undergraduate enrolment as the male students. Only six women entered the Ph.D., Master of Science, Master of Business Administration or the Master of Applied Science programs. Since the majority received their Masters of Arts degree, a Ph.D degree

was not an option at Windsor except in the field of psychology. Thus, only those women who pursued their education in a non-traditional field, clearly the minority, would benefit from the Ph.D. program at Windsor at this time. The very areas chosen to offer and develop Ph.D. programs had to have been strong faculties and to be considered areas of growth. Clearly, the faculties of Applied Science and Business Administration had the resources necessary to offer post-graduate degrees while many departments in the Social Sciences did not. It is significant, nonetheless, that those faculties that attracted the majority of women did not have the resources nor the support to offer graduate degrees. It is possible that a gender barrier existed and gave traditionally male-dominated fields more academic attention and credence.

At the undergraduate level as well, the majority of women entered the Faculty of Arts. This pattern of women's enrolment combined with the University's limited number of doctoral programs prohibited the majority of women from pursuing post-graduate work at Windsor. In the 1964-65 term, 517 students were registered in the undergraduate program. Of this total, 279 students pursued their general B.A., 163 men and 116 women. This may be compared with registration in the general Bachelor of Science program in which forty-four men and only five women enrolled. The Commerce faculty was, in the 1964-65 term, exclusively male, while only one woman out of a total registration of forty-one students was found in the Bachelor of

Applied Science program. In 1964, the faculty of Nursing attracted a total of eleven women.

By 1965, the enrolment pattern of female students had not changed dramatically. The majority of female undergraduates, 130 out of a total of 311 students, could be found in the general Bachelor of Arts program. The Bachelor of Science general degree program had a total of fifty-five students; five of whom were female. The Bachelor of Physical Education, Applied Science and Commerce programs had a combined registration of seventy-four students, none of whom were women. The program that attracted the majority of women, aside from Arts was, not surprisingly, Nursing.

From 1964 to 1969, women at the University of Windsor were underrepresented in a significant number of graduate and post-graduate faculties. In particular, faculties such as engineering, commerce, business administration and science, traditionally perceived as "male disciplines", had decidedly small numbers of women enrolled. The faculties of Applied Science and Commerce, continued to have an exclusively male student body. In the 1967-68 term the faculty of Physical Education had two women out of a total complement of fifteen. By 1969, there were two women, out of a total of forty-eight students, who graduated with their bachelor of Commerce degrees.

The underrepresentation of women in a significant number of disciplines was not unique to the University of Windsor during the late 1960's. In comparison to the participation of women in

Canadian universities, Windsor reflected general patterns. In the country as a whole, women and men entered those faculties that reflected assumptions about gender roles. At the undergraduate level during the late 1960's, Canadian women comprised the overwhelming majority of students in Secretarial Science, Household Science, Nursing and Physio/Occupational Therapy and Medical Technology. [33] Women were significantly underrepresented in Engineering and Applied Science, Architecture, Commerce and Business Administration and Public Administration. [34]

At the graduate level, the participation of women at the University of Windsor during the late 1900's again reflected national patterns. In the country as a whole, women were pursuing their graduate degrees to a lesser extent than men and were doing so in different faculties. Women undertaking their Master's degree at Canadian universities during the 1969 - 1970 school year accounted for 21.5 % of the national total of graduate students. In specific area of specialization, such as Engineering and the Applied Sciences, 2 % of the national total were women. Likewise, Mathematics and the Physical Sciences attracted only 8 % of the nation's female Master's students. Other areas of specialization were clearly female dominated or had significant numbers of women. Women accounted for 62 % of the national total of graduate students registered in Fine and Applied Arts and 36 % of the total of graduate students registered in the Humanities. [35]

At the Doctoral level, women accounted for only 9 % of the total number of students registered in Canadian universities at the end of the 1960's. The largest percentage of women participating at this level could be found in the Humanities and in the faculty of Education. Conversely, the faculties of Engineering and Applied Science had no female doctoral graduates in Canada during 1969 - 1970. The exclusion of women from a number of disciplines rested, in part, on the dictates of gender and women's assigned role. [36] That certain academic pursuits were perceived as outside of women's assigned role effectively excluded females from choosing these paths and presented a further source of her "separate and `different' education".

The non-participation of women in certain disciplines at Windsor and in universities across Canada during the late 1960's rested, in part, on gender assumptions about what women could and could not do. That certain academic pursuits were perceived as inappropriate for women, affected and continues to affect their academic and career choices. Sociological studies argue that by the time young men and women enter university, the effects of "sex role stereotyping" at lower levels of the educational system play a significant part in determining academic pursuits. Thus the notion of "sex role stereotyping" has been advanced in a number of sociological studies as a means of understanding what processes culminate in the gendered division of education.

The power of "sex role stereotyping" effects students at a young age. Throughout their schooling, girls have been taught to

be "soft, kind and nurturant". Young men have been taught to be "independent, strong and ambitious". [37] Thus, the entire school system has reinforced the differences between girls and boys and women and men. Specific subjects thus become associated with a certain gender. Young men, assumed to be the future business leaders, scientists and doctors, are encouraged to excel in the sciences and mathematics. Women, assumed to be the future mothers and homemakers are encouraged to excel at domestic and nurturing skills. [38] The legacy of this "sex role stereotyping" has been, in turn, carried over to the university. This "complementary" division of education and labour based on gender has not, however, led to greater equality between the sexes. Women's work and her perceived place in society has been traditionally valued and compensated less that men's work.

The underrepresentation of women in many clubs and organizations continued in the 1960's. Their virtual absence from positions of authority ensured that male concerns and male voices would dictate the position of the entire student body. As in the previous decade, the University had a number of campus clubs and organizations in the 1960's. A significant number of these student-centred undertakings were organized around a particular faculty, such as the Arts Council, or sought to bring together those students interested in non-academic pursuits, such as the Ski Club or the Jazz Club. Significantly, the Arts Council represented not only the largest faculty on campus, but it was also the one with the largest number of women. Despite this,

nine out the Council's ten administrative offices were held by men. A number of similar clubs and organization had exclusively male officers, for example, the Commerce, Math, Political Science, Economics, Engineering and Chess Clubs, as well as the Science Council. The Lord Acton Society organized within the History Department, had a total of eight students, only one of whom was female. Described under the caption, " A knowledge of history is said to be a knowledge of man," the Society did not attract a significant number of female historians. [39] Two student organizations attracted a primarily female membership. The Nurses Club had only four male members while in the Sociology Club there was one lone male. The Languages Club, as well as the Ski Club, Flying Club and Jazz Club had a more equitable gender balance.

The exclusion of women from powerful positions on the Student's Council was evident in throughout the 1960's. In 1967, the Council was made up of eleven students, three of whom were women. Linda Renaud was recording secretary, Barbara McPherson was Arts Representative and Elaine Peter was Nursing Representative. [40] Under the caption "Aspiring young businessmen and top brass business leaders", the Commerce Club, in 1968, remained an exclusively male preserve.

The push on the part of S.A.C. during the late 1960's to "democratize" students government did not include specific provisions for women. Women's inclusion in student organizations continued to be limited by the dictates of gender and the

discriminatory attitudes expressed towards them. In 1969, the Ambassador Yearbook proclaimed that "student power had come to Windsor." [41] Male students almost exclusively, however, held the reins of power. The activities of the World University Service of Canada organization on campus promoted a negative image of women on campus. Based on the images of women that the organization freely projected, student's rights and democratic equality had little to do with women's rights at this time. For example, in an effort to raise funds for the 1967 SHARE campaign, an annual fundraising event to aid universities in developing countries,the organization held a "slave auction".

> Money was raised for SHARE by means of the Ugly Man contest, and a slave auction (the cute little blond third from the right brought a record of $112.50) There were even two for the price of one so you could double your pleasure and get eighteen hours worth in only sixteen. [42]

The marginalization of women and their identification as secondary to men, is also evident in a particular passage posing as advice to the "typical Windsor student" - a male.

> And when you get out of class, there are a few diversions to keep you happy through the afternoon. Relax. Take it easy. Drop over to the Bridge. Find a girl. Play hearts. Watch Batman. After all, he won't mind if you hand in your paper a little late. [43]

Together, these two passages from the Yearbook describe a collegiate atmosphere which marginalized women. In its characterization as a "major innovation", the slave auction was praised for the "sale of ten tittering seductive campus nubiles." [44] That a women could be "bought and sold" in a slave auction

or be characterized as a pleasant diversion for a male student seriously undermined any degree of academic equality. Their symbolic association with sexual subordination to men may have posed a threat to the legitimacy of women's contributions in the classroom. It is also significant to note the characterization of the typical Windsor professor as a `he'.

During this decade of "democratization", women at Windsor had their social lives constrained by traditional paternalistic assumptions about their need for protection. Although male residents could not entertain female guests in their rooms after a designated hour, they were not bound by a curfew. The existence of a curfew for women suggested that they were more vulnerable than their male counterparts, unable to look after themselves, and thus required stricter institutional protection and control. A similar situation existed for women at other institutions. At McGill University, for example, strict rules regulating women's behaviour existed at Royal Victoria College until their repeal in 1972. [45] At Royal Victoria, male visitors had to adhere to a "signing in" system, and could not visit women outside of the designated hours. [46] After "student pressure in the form of complaints and petitions", a liberalization of the house rules at the women's residence resulted. [47] At Windsor, the notion that women were "minors" curtailed their entitlement to freedom of movement. The description of the S.A.C. Christmas Party in 1968 demonstrates women's lack of autonomy at Windsor.

> All the streamers were hung through the centre so dear
> For the students had heard Santa's coming this year
> The girls from Electa received a curfew of three
> To go to the parties, have a ball and be free.[48]

In the March 7, 1969 issue of the student newspaper, The Lance, the formal abolition of the curfew was announced. An unsigned response to the development, conceivably written by a woman, indicated that some students were aware of the unsatisfactory atmosphere for women on campus symbolized by the curfew.

> Someday it will be discovered that women are as able to accept responsibility as men are. It will be discovered that they can think as well as cook, or act as well as sew.[49]

The tone of the passage suggests that women students at Windsor had yet to enjoy the same status afforded to men. The longing for a "someday" in which women were not limited by the dictates of their gender indicates that the era of "student power" at Windsor did not challenge the sources of women's separateness on campus. The passage also suggests that some women at Windsor clearly recognized the artificiality of gender defined differences between women and men and had rising expectations regarding their ability and their potential on campus and in society.

The attempt to democratize student government and to open meaningful avenues of discussions with the institution's administration, for a portion of the student population, was characteristic of the evolving character of higher education in Canada. In the 1960's, Canadian students were being mobilized

around the peace issue as were their American counterparts. Strong support for nuclear disarmament became characteristic of the student movement. [50] While the S.A.C. members clamoured for a more active voice in the institution's decision-making process, the level of women's involvement did not significantly improve nor was it the object of much serious deliberation. As in other areas, within the peace and civil rights movements, women were often excluded from positions of leadership and their needs marginalized.

The rise of feminism in the late 1960's began to sensitize the members of women's organizations to their unsatisfactory position within the movement. It became more apparent that even within the student movement, women were relegated to secondary positions and excluded from positions of power and decision making. [51] Within the liberating guise of the student movement, women found themselves further separated from meaningful reforms. This was certainly true at the University of Windsor. During the 1960's women themselves made little attempt to become integrated into the mainstream of the campus nor were they encouraged or expected to do so.

At the student and faculty level, women did not enjoy a radical reordering of their positions during the 1960's. The attitudes expressed towards them frequently betrayed a misogynist view. That female residence students were bound by a curfew until the late 1960's curtailed their ability to develop a degree of self-determination and perpetuated their "separateness" based

upon gender. This secondary position occupied by women at various levels of the University stood in contrast with the views expressed by the administration. Numerous excerpts from both the Report of the President, and the Office of Information Services Memo newsletters throughout the decade paint a more progressive picture. In the absence of a conscious effort to create conditions of equality for women on campus, the atmosphere of growth and modernization promoted by the administration and the push for a more democratic system of student representation remained ineffectual. Carol Lasser concludes that

> Clearly, if equality had never been the intention of those who allowed the entrance of women into coeducational classrooms, then it was not surprising when women found it difficult to elevate their status within those learning environments.[52]

The tension between change and tradition was still very much a part of women's experience at the University of Windsor in the decade of the sixties.

Endnotes to Chapter Three

1. R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones and Donald B. Smith, Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Limited, 1988), p. 458.

2. Report of the President, 1963-1964, p. 79.

3. Enrolment statistics for these years can be found in the Report of the President which provides an annual total of student enrolment for the period 1961-62 to 1969-1970.

4. Ibid. The list of official enrolment statistics for these years offer a breakdown for the number of male and female students.

5. Office of Information Services, Memo, 16 December, 1968 (Windsor: University of Windsor), p. 2.

6. Ibid., p. 2.

7. Office of Information Services, Memo, 13 March 1969, p. 1.

8. Taped Interview A.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Report of the President, "Religious Denomination", 1956-1957, p. 102.

12. Ibid., 1967-1968, p. 170.

13. Ibid., 1963-1964, p. 66.

14. Ibid., 1964-1965,p. 55.

15. Ibid., p. 55.

16. Ibid., p. 55.

17. Ibid., p. 55.

18. Ibid., p. 55.

19. Ambassador Yearbook, 1965, pp. 7-15.

20. Anne Rochon Ford, A Path Not Strewn with Roses, p. 13. The author maintains, for example, that at the University of Toronto, faculty positions have traditionally been a male bastion. She states that "in the one hundred years of female presence at the University, women faculty have advance at a snail's pace".

21. Taped Interview A.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. Report of the President, 1959-1960, p. 57A.

25. Ibid., p. 57A.

26. Ibid., 1963-1964, p. 56.

27. Ibid., p. 56.

28. Ibid., p. 56.

29. Ibid. , p. 56.

30. Ambassador Yearbook, 1966, p. 28.

31. In her study of Queen's University, Nicole Neatby also found that women's voices were excluded from student government and thus from decisions affecting their education. See p. 48.

32. Report of the President, Degrees Conferred, 1964-1969.

33. McCalla Vickers and Adam, But Can You Type ?, pp. 59 - 60. Women as a percentage of the total number of students across Canada registered in these programs for 1969 - 1970 were 99.6 %, 99 %, 98 %, 96 %, and 92 %.

34. Ibid., pp. 59 - 60. Similarly, women accounted for 1 %, 9 %, 7 % and 9 % (respectively) of the national total of students enrolled in these programs.

35. Ibid., p. 79.

36. Neil Guppy, Doug Balson and Susan Vellutini, "Women and Higher Education in Canada Society," in Women and Education: A Canadian Perspective, eds. Jane Gaskell and Arlene McLaren (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1987), p. 182.

37. Gaskell and McLaren, eds., "Introduction", Women and Education, p. 6 - 7.

38. Ibid., p. 7.

39. Ambassador Yearbook, 1967, p. 56.

40. Ibid., 1968, p. 45.

41. Ibid., 1969, p. 88.

42. Ibid., 1967, p. 81.

43. Ibid., 1968, p. 19.

44. Ibid., p. 141.

45. Gillett, We Walked Very Warily, p. 253.

46. Ibid., p. 253.

47. Ibid., pp. 254-255.

48. Ambassador Yearbook, 1969, p.88.

49. The Lance, University of Windsor, 7 March, 1969, p. 4.

50. Cyril Levitt, Children of Privilege : Student Revolt in the Sixties - A Study of Student Movements in Canada, the United States, and West Germany (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 43.

51. Ibid. , p. 107. For a more personalized account of the alienation of feminists from the New Left student movements in Canada, see Myrna Kotash, Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada (Toronto: James Lorimer and Company Publishers, 1980).

52. Carol Lasser, ed. Educating Men and Women Together: Coeducation in a Changing World (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), p. 4.

Chapter Four

" From a Timid Plea to a Genuine Forum "

The Impact of the Women's Movement and the Demands for Change at the University of Windsor

Unlike the preceding decades, the events of the 1970's and 1980's brought the experience of women at the University to the forefront. The second wave of feminism, which gave rise to the contemporary Women's Movement, initiated an increased awareness of women's secondary position. At the University of Windsor and at campuses across the country, the sources of a "separate and `different' education" for women that had become implicitly entrenched in the institution's structure, were, in the effort to eradicate them, made explicit once more. As the Women's Movement succeeded in calling attention to the nature of women's oppression, some members of the academic community began the lengthy process of initiating change. Women's Centres and action groups were formed at various universities to provide women with a network of support and information. A number of Status Reports, detailing the conditions of women's experience at universities across the country, were undertaken during this period to initiate change. While significant advances for women at the University of Windsor were demanded and won, the

institution was slow to modify. In the absence of mandatory policies and measures aimed at guaranteeing equitable treatment, women at the University of Windsor had no choice but to continue to rally against the existence of sexism and the sources of their "separateness". [1]

The second wave of feminism that emerged in Canada in the late 1960's and early 1970's facilitated the increased awareness that women were often denied the power to choose their own life's direction. The members of the contemporary Women's Movement argued that women were limited by society's assumptions regarding their proper role. The systemic disadvantages suffered by Canadian women were being brought to the forefront. The movement was not limited to Canada, but rather represented a much broader development in which women in Western countries generally rallied for more freedom outside the home. [2] In the university setting, a growing agitation for the removal of barriers to female academics became a significant part of their experience. The work of feminist scholars detailed concrete statistical evidence of discrimination in the hiring, remuneration, and promotion of female professors. In addition, these undertakings inspired a new awareness of the underrepresentation of women in both graduate and undergraduate faculties.

Feminists formed organizations, analyzed women's oppression and proposed strategies for change. Women from established organizations such as the Canadian Federation of University Women and the Y.W.C.A. lobbied for a Royal Commission on the Status of

Women (RCSW). The demands were answered. On February 3, 1967, the Commission was appointed; it submitted its report in September, 1970. [3] The mandate of the Commission testified to the increasing weight of women's demands in Canada. The Commission was to "inquire into and report upon the status of women in Canada and to recommend what steps might be taken by the Federal Government to ensure for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Canadian society." [4]

The findings of the Royal Commission confirmed women's unsatisfactory position. The Commission reported that pay was generally lower for traditionally female professions than for other professions; equal pay laws were inadequate; paid maternity leave was rare; few women reached senior levels in companies and institutions; and that women had less opportunity to enter and to advance in many occupations and professions. [5]

One of the results of the RCSW was that partial government funding for women's groups was made available through several sources: the Secretary of State, Opportunities for Youth grants and Local Initiative Programme grants. [6] These funding organizations facilitated the growth of women's centres across the country. While the RCSW represented an important recognition of the reality of women's secondary position in Canadian society, its potential as a blueprint for change was not fully realized. The solutions presented in the Report focused on promoting attitudinal changes towards women's potential, but left entrenched systemic barriers to their oppression unchallenged.

> ...solutions concentrate in altering ideas and the early learning process that transmits them, on attacking each inequality as a separate phenomenon, on establishing successful female role models, on changing legislation, on changing ideas, not structures.[7]

The Report on the Status of Women gave governmental recognition to the need to change and improve women's place in a number of sectors. It did not, however, provide corrective measures to dismantle gender barriers that exist in the very organization and operation of institutions, such as the Canadian university.

The process of addressing and removing gender barriers in the university was undertaken by women members themselves. Women's studies programs were created, books and journals published and the degree of collective discussion enhanced. At Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, a women's caucus of the Students for a Democratic Union group was formed in 1968. This organization became the off-campus Working Women's Association and Vancouver's Women's Caucus. Similar caucuses were founded at the University of Alberta and the University of Regina. At the University of Toronto, the Women's Caucus of the Student Union for Peace Action formed the Toronto Women's Liberation Movement in the fall of 1968.[8] A Women's Liberation organization was founded at the University of Windsor in 1972.[9]

The most widespread result of the increased analysis and dialogue generated by the Women's Movement in Canadian universities was the production of a number of Status of Women reports.[10] Few of these reports were written from an historical perspective but rather concentrated on the "here and

now". The purpose of such studies was essentially twofold: to analyze the current situation of female faculty, administrative and support staff and students, and to offer a series of recommendations aimed at benefitting the women involved. A recurring conclusion in each of these reports centred on the unsatisfactory position of women in the various institutions of higher education. In their 1972 study of the status of women at McMaster University, for example, Lynn McDonald and Marcia Smith Lenglet concluded that "the relationship between men and women entrenched in the university in 1971 was that of "superiors" to "subordinates". [11]

> Women at McMaster in 1971 were primarily undergraduates, part-time extension students, secretaries, clerks, maids and food service workers. They had subordinate jobs in the Library, Computer Centre and administration. [12]

The work of professional scholars Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam brought together the scattered findings on various institutions into one interpretive study in 1977. The authors condemned the organization of the university itself for perpetuating the division of labour between men and women in the academic setting. Vickers and Adam maintained that, by virtue of their gender, men were encouraged to succeed in the demanding professional faculties, while women were simultaneously held back. They point out that, in fact, the "typical student", around whom institutional policies and responses had been designed, was assumed to be a male preparing himself for a career after graduation. [13] This reality, they argued, served to

exclude women from attaining power and status in Canadian society.

> Here is the evidence that far fewer women than men enter Canadian universities; that those women who do enter are less likely to obtain the certification which would permit them to enter the higher or senior professions. [14]

The feminist analysis used by Vickers and Adam led to the conclusion that institutions of higher education in Canada had to change significantly. Their methodology was carefully scrutinized. Reviewer Gwendoline Pilkington pointed out that while the central premise of the work, "that Canadian women should have equal status with Canadian men, that they can and should participate fully and equally with men in all spheres of higher education" was not a point of contention, "the discerning reader may quarrel with the kind of evidence used to support these contentions." [15] Pilkington maintained that "of the 40 tables presented, not one contains data compiled beyond 1969." [16] Pilkington, nonetheless, was encouraged by the authors' bold exposure of the engrained yet discriminatory policies that operate at the faculty level.

> It is encouraging to see laid bare charges against the universities for their blatant exploitation of women as part-time academic drones; of the iniquitous but rarely admitted hiring practice (the "old-boy network") which makes it virtually impossible for anyone, male or female and however well qualified, to obtain desired employment...[17]

Thus, Pilkington suggested that, like many institutions, the university structure presented barriers to the equal employment of women. Vickers and Adam also suggest that women themselves

must work for change. "It is essential", argue the authors, "that women start to ask the question `education for what?' and to seek realistic answers." [18] In the study, Vickers and Adam concluded that the university structure had to change and the barriers systematically removed before women, at all levels of the university, could enjoy equality with men. To institute such change, women themselves began to demand concrete responses from university administrations.

In 1975, the growing dissatisfaction among women at Canada's universities was manifested within the upper echelons of the academic community. Speaking on behalf of female faculty members, Norma V. Bowen, the first woman to hold the office of Chair of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, called for active solutions to the unequal treatment of female members. Bowen pointed out that in the areas of recruitment and hiring, salaries and conditions of employment, tenure, promotion and administrative posts, female faculty members suffered overt and unjustified discrimination. Maintaining that the university continued to be a "male preserve", Bowen encouraged university administrations to "make a conscious effort to examine their attitudes and practices towards women." [19] The comments of the Chair reinforced the severity of the situation and further added a degree of clout and legitimacy to the demands of women academics.

At the University of Windsor, the pace of improvements for women was slow and laborious. J. Francis Leddy, who retired from

the presidency of the University in 1978, did not mention the increased activity on the part of women in his recollections of the institution's developments during his tenure. While the student enrolment had grown from 1800 in 1964 to 8000 in 1978, the increased enrolment of women was not discussed. Instead, Leddy focused on the physical growth of the institution. The development of the Faculties of Law and Business Administration upgraded the campus from a small liberal arts college, according to Dr. Leddy, to "true university status." [20] Despite their absence in Leddy's account, women at the University of Windsor were beginning to organize and to promote their interests. During the 1970's, women students and faculty members initiated a number of forums designed to improve the level of their experience at Windsor. Women faculty organized the Centre for Women's Interests and Concerns, the Faculty Association's Committee on the Status of Women, and began to offer Women's Studies courses. By the 1971 - 1972 calendar year, the need for women at Windsor to have access to contraception controls was discussed for the first time. In the attempt to promote a more equitable atmosphere, action groups were formed for, and by, female students. Employing the student newspaper, The Lance, reporters encouraged students to increase their awareness of women's position on campus. Together, women at the faculty and student level worked to erode the sources of their "separate and `different' education."

The Centre for Women's Interest and Concerns was established

at the University of Windsor in 1972. The Centre was to be a focal point for programs on campus "relating directly to needs and interests of all women associated with the university." [21] The Dean of Women, Evelyn McLean, had requested that a space that had come available in Vanier Hall be granted for the creation of a Centre. The Centre contained a collection of feminist literature and it organized informal "awareness sessions." The planning for the Centre was entrusted to an Advisory Council composed of Faculty, students (full and part-time), staff, and representatives of other institutions, agencies, and action groups in the city of Windsor. In promoting the activities and aims of the Centre for Women's Interests and Concerns, McLean remarked that

> Remember, the Centre for Women is, as the name implies, a resource opportunity for women, but all men who are concerned about the furtherance of equality and justice are most welcome to contribute their ideas. [22]

In addition to its casual atmosphere, the Centre at times assumed a more structured and formal role in the attempt to answer the needs and interests of women on campus. The Centre organized an annual "Weekend for Women." In 1974, for instance, the second "Weekend for Women" attracted over 200 participants. The theme of the weekend was "Women in the Working World" and included lectures and panel discussions as well as representatives of such organizations as Women's Liberation and the Human Rights Commission. Since no evidence suggests that pro-choice organizations were also asked to participate, the

presence of Birthright, an anti-abortion organization, at the conference suggested that a Catholic element was still present at the University.

That certain members of the University of Windsor promoted the Women's Centre testified not only to the changing attitudes regarding women's education, but to the efforts of pioneering women themselves. In an article in the University's Alumni Times Magazine in 1973, McLean reminded her readers that the Centre was an integral part of a movement to further and enhance "equality and justice."[23] McLean's actions, ensuring that the campus community was made aware of the special needs of women, provided the first institutional step towards the erosion of discriminatory policies and attitudes.

Throughout the late 1970s, women at the University of Windsor continued to organize for themselves and to improve their situation. At the academic and administrative level, programs specifically designed for women strove to promote a more positive atmosphere on campus. Such programs acted as correctives to the sources of women's "separate and `different' education." In 1975, for example, the President's Committee on Equal Rights, chaired by F.A Demarco held its first meeting. By 1977, the Committee requested that

> faculty members attempt to provide particular encouragement to female students, or others who may be in the minority, to attract them to continue their studies through graduate work.[24]

The Committee's request for voluntary action on the part of

faculty members to encourage women to engage in graduate work in 1977 continues in discussions at the University. The effectiveness of voluntary measures to improve women's involvement, however, is still open to debate. The recognition at the administrative level, in 1977, of a gap between the number of men and women in graduate school is, nonetheless, significant. That the number of female students entering graduate programmes was significantly lower than males was perceived by the Committee as problematic and undesirable. Despite this recognition, the numerical imbalance between women and men at the graduate level continues at the University and is reflective of the national trend. While the overall attainment of postgraduate degrees has increased for women, men still dominate in graduate school (Appendix II).[25] More significant, however, and not addressed by the Committee in 1977, is the continuation of women's underrepresentation in traditionally male disciplines, such as engineering, business administration and the sciences(Appendix III).

A second initiative on the part of female faculty to improve women's position at the University of Windsor, the Faculty Association's Committee on the Status of Women Academics, was appointed in 1975. The Committee consisted of a chair, two representatives appointed by the Faculty Association, one undergraduate and one graduate student, two CUPE representatives, one representative of administrative and support staff, and one representative of the secretarial and clerical staff.[26]

Kathleen McCrone, then an assistant professor in the History Department of the University of Windsor, acted as chair. The Women's Committee studied the "relative positions of male and female members of the faculty with particular regard for remuneration, appointment and promotion." [27] The Committee's findings, presented to the administration in a report in 1975, confirmed the assessment of Bowen regarding the university as an essentially male preserve. Among its conclusions, the Committee confirmed that male members of Windsor's teaching staff benefitted from the inequitable treatment of women. [28] In a report in the OCUFA Newsletter in 1975, Professor McCrone took a challenging stance. She maintained that

> The Canadian university can and must do everything in its power to "liberate" all its members so that they may develop fully - personally, intellectually, and professionally. [29]

The essential message contained in McCrone's comment called for an end to the perpetuation of women's "separate and `different' education." "By liberating" women in academic setting, McCrone concluded, those barriers that hinder the equal experience of all members would be addressed.

The introduction of Women's Studies courses, undertaken by women faculty members at Windsor, attempted to improve the academic understanding of women's issues. Their inclusion as a legitimate area of study provided an important opportunity to erode gender barriers to women in the university and in society. In a report to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada prepared by the Status of Women in Canadian Universities

committee undertaken in August of 1975, "to find out what activities are being undertaken in relation to the status of women in academia," the University of Windsor was listed, however, as having "no specific women's studies programs or courses." [30]

Windsor's performance in establishing a women's studies program stood in sharp contrast to that of other universities. For example, at York University a total of forty-five courses on women for academic credit were in place in 1975. [31] At the University of Toronto, the first women's studies course was designated in 1971. [32] Designed as an overview course offered through the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, a second course was added in 1972 by the History Department. Today the Women's Studies programme at the University of Toronto is recognized as an academic discipline that encourages the study of "what, traditionally, many academic disciplines have tended to slight: the significance of the contributions women have made socially, intellectually and culturally to human history." [33]

By the later years of the 1970s, Windsor did begin to offer courses in women's studies. [34] An ad hoc Women's Studies faculty group was formed in 1979 specifically to "promote interdisciplinary cooperation and the academic study of women." [35] In 1985, with the support of the Women's Studies Faculty Group and the Department of History, a formal proposal was submitted to the University administration for a new programme, a Certificate in Women's Studies. The programme was approved in

1986. Characterized as a "sign that the University has made a commitment to progress and equality," the Certificate in Women's Studies was added to the University's calendar in that year.[36]

The program, however, suffers from serious administrative inadequacies. It does not have a budget, its own Women Studies courses and space, faculty appointments, nor control over what courses are offered. In addition, no formal means for tracking students are in place since they do not register in Women's Studies, but only declare for the Certificate upon graduation. The programme, while initially viewed as a progressive step forward, has been marginalized within the University and continues to be denied status as an academic discipline unto itself. As a certificate programme, Women's Studies, like Family Studies, are relegated to a secondary position at the University. In the most recent summary of registration, students in the Women's Studies programme receive no formal recognition (Appendix III).

Additional attempts to improve women's education at the University were made in 1976. In that year, the Women's Centre published a Directory of Professional Women at Windsor. The booklet listed seventy-eight women on staff, faculty and in ancillary areas who were willing to provide students with counselling opportunities and to serve as role models. In that same year, a Women's Orientation Week was held. The week featured a feminist film festival and open discussion groups. An International Women's reception was also held throughout the

week. The Senior Women's Honour Society was initiated and sought to recognize female undergraduates whose academic standing and "co-curricular activities" made them outstanding students and women. The award became a permanent part of her official University records. [37]

The concern voiced over the unsatisfactory position of women on campus at the faculty level was also manifested among female students. During the late 1970's, female students made attempts to organize and sustain women's action groups. These attempts were, however, marred by the invisibility of the groups on campus and their internal divisiveness. In the pages of The Lance, female editorial staff often used their position to invite their readers to action and to counteract the effects of apathy. The issues surrounding women's secondary position at the institution, and in Canadian society in general, were absorbed by a portion of the student body at Windsor and were addressed in an ongoing and often informal forum.

In November of 1975, a survey was conducted on campus by students and faculty to "detect possible areas of needs among women and to establish a sample of values." [38] The survey contained sixteen questions and was answered by 270 female respondents. The results showed that 78% of the women who had completed the survey, had, at some point, experienced a "denial of their rights." [39] Other conclusions reached by the survey were that women found it increasingly difficulty to manage the responsibilities of studies, family and work. [40] Although the

survey was described as "informal and unscientific" it nevertheless represented an attempt on the part of some members of the faculty and student body to capture the mood of women on the campus.

A number of academic forums concerned with various issues relating to women took place during the mid-1970's and testified to an increased awareness among members of the institution. In October of 1975, the Home Economics Club planned a five day conference on "Women in a Changing Society". Issues that were addressed during the conference included women in business, women in athletics, and women's legal rights. [41] Iona College sponsored a series of lectures in November of 1975 entitled "A New Look at Male - Female Relationships." At the heart of the series rested the issue of gender and its different meanings and manifestations. The purpose of the series was to "explore the nature of the connection or betweeness that links men and women in various kinds of relationships." [42] Laura Sabia, former president of the Canadian Federation of University Women, founder of the Committee on Equality for Women and a leading voice in the call for the RCSW, was featured at the University in November, 1978. Sabia's address dealt with the issues of "Women, Law and Liberation." The late 1970's at the University of Windsor thus witnessed a number of academic events centred on the position of women and gender issues. That issues surrounding women's particular experiences in Canadian society were deemed important enough to warrant such exposure testified to a new level of

awareness on the part of growing segment of the University's community.

With the appointment of Dr. Walter Wren as the University's medical director in 1970, the issue of birth control appears for the first time in the Report of the President. After his first year in his new office, Dr. Wren reported that the "significant drop" in pregnancy rates among Windsor students was a direct result of both the new availability of birth control and "a stepped-up educational program." [43] The ability of female students to take control over their reproductive capacity marked a change from the past in which no mention of such medical services for women was made. Clearly, in the 1970s student health services at Windsor provided a number of women with protection from unwanted pregnancy. The availability of birth control at the university health centre also signalled the campus's growing secularization.

On a number of occasions throughout the later years of the 1970's female editorial staff on The Lance addressed the issue of women's rights. This development stood in sharp contrast to the preceding decades at Windsor in which women rarely wrote for the student newspaper and scant attention was paid to their position on campus. Commenting on the significance of the "Women in a Changing Canadian Society" conference, for example, reporter Margaret Ducharme concluded that

> In the struggle between male and female polemical perceptions, ultimately women must overcome their own inertia. They must learn to respond as individuals with

their own identities...[44]

Ducharme, in this instance, took the opportunity to call the readers of the newspaper, specifically female students, to action. Encouraging women to "take advantage of the opportunities available to them," Ducharme employed The Lance as a potential organ of reform.

Lindsay Hall-Smeets, another Lance reporter, followed in Ducharme's footsteps. In her 1979 article, Hall-Smeets used the occasion of International Women's Day to highlight the inadequate position of women. The reporter remarked that

> When the composition of the faculty reflects the composition of the student body, we will have something to celebrate. Until then, International Women's Day can only serve as another focus on political, social and economic inequalities.[45]

In their appeals for improvement, these particular reporters used The Lance to both encourage women and to lament their continued struggle for change. Unlike the previous decades in which women's voices were rarely included in student-run organizations, these particular women not only reported for the newspaper, but took the opportunity to push women's concerns to the forefront.

During the latter years of the 1970's, female students at the University of Windsor made a successful attempt to initiate a women's action group. The absence of a coherent and effective women's organization was pointed out by student Brenda McLister. In September of 1977, the S.A.C.'s Board of Directors attempted to import Playboy Bunnies as guests of honour at the University's Casino Night. In her report of the incident in The Lance,

McLister pointed out that

> Women, you have every right to be enraged. But until you become more politically involved, S.A.C. will continue to ignore your rights. [46]

In response to the incident, Maryon Overholt and Brenda McLister initiated a meeting to arouse interest in forming a student organization to combat such overt sexism. The students maintained that such a group was necessary to prevent the Women's Centre from falling into disuse. [47] The immediate objective of the group was to form an executive and a constitution so that they could be recognized as a club and receive S.A.C. funding. The group was formed into three committees: an affirmative action group (to increase women's involvement in the University), a programming committee (to organize activities to increase women's awareness), and a speaker's committee (to organize guest speakers and forums). By November 25, 1977, the Equal Rights and Awareness Group (E.R.A.) was ratified as a club by the Students Administrative Council. "Sexual discrimination on campus," it was reported, "necessitates such a group." [48]

The effectiveness of the E.R.A. group as a cohesive voice for women students at the institution was, by the mid-1980s, questionable. Clearly, between 1977 and 1985, women at the University of Windsor continued to lack a powerful and self-sustaining action group. In 1985, for example, The Lance reported that the University of Windsor was "without an active women's group." [49] The report went on to applaud the creation, at this time, of Phase I, a women's organization formed on campus to

"project a positive attitude." The group strove to provide an arena for women to voice their concerns and to encourage involvement in social and campus issues. However, the notion that the University had previously been without an organization promoting the interests of women proved to be an inaccurate assumption. Clearly, a large segment of the community, including some members of The Lance staff, were unaware of several existing organizations. The Women's Forum, for example, had been operating on the campus since 1983. It was supported in large part by the Graduate Students' Society and was open to all staff, students and faculty. The Forum held regular meetings, operated a resource centre and advertised in The Lance regularly.[50] In addition to the Women's Forum, several other organizations for women also existed at this time: the Campus Women's Committee, the Faculty Association's Status of Women Committee and the Women in Law group. This particular incident pointed to the degree of invisibility that women's organizations at the University of Windsor had to overcome and served as a subtle reminder of their isolation on campus. In a letter to the editor of the Lance, a member of the Women's Forum remarked that "it would be far more productive if all concerned parties worked in unison rather then at odds to achieve a mutual objective."[51] Clearly, the University continued to lack a unified student-centred organization that worked closely with faculty level groups in the interest of all women at the University of Windsor.

During the 1970's women at the University of Windsor not

only formed organizations around particular issues, they also began to challenge the fundamental sources of a "separate and `different' education" for women. The second wave of feminism gave the initial impetus to various activities on the part of women at the University. A level of discussion, focusing on women's experience in every aspect of Canadian society, was initiated during the period. This, in turn, gave rise to a level of awareness on the part of both faculty and students. Women at both levels openly discussed the existence of discrimination against women and organized themselves into action groups. Those realities of women's experience at Windsor that had previously gone unchallenged began to come under fire. Faculty members had exposed the existence of hiring and promotional policies that disadvantaged women. Female students used their newspaper, The Lance, as an organ for the dissemination of information pertaining to women's position on campus. What had begun as a "timid plea," in the words of Evelyn McLean, had evolved into a "genuine forum."

Still, reminders of women's segregation on campus continue to exist. The fate of the Home Economics program at Windsor serves as a good example. During the 1970's, the interest in establishing an Honours program continued. On January 17, 1974, the Senate approved the program. Although the Faculty Executive Committee had originally turned down the program, the decision was appealed and reversed. The appeal stated that in 1973, Home Economics at Windsor had the fourth highest number of majors. At

the time, half of the Home Economics majors expressed an interest in the Honours program. With twenty-nine students enrolled, the new Honours program in Home Economics at Windsor was initiated in the fall of 1974.

The number of students registered in Home Economics reached a peak in 1976 with 120 students. During the 1975 - 76 and 1976 -77 school years, course offerings nearly doubled rising from 18 to 35 courses. Five Honours programs appeared in the university calender for 1979 - 80. These programs included Honours Home Economics in each of the specialty area of Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, Family and Consumer Studies, and Housing and Interior Design.

On June 24, 1985, however, the Senate voted that the four Honours level specialties in the Department be deleted from the calendar. The Senate based its decision on the small number of professors in the Department - only six had been employed for the past four years. One year later, On June 18, 1986, the Senate approved a motion that would limit the Department's offerings, effective with the class admitted in September, 1986, to the General degree with a major in Home Economics. The small number of faculty and the expected retirements in the Department were given as reasons for the decision to downgrade the Department. By 1987, the Senate decided that the Department of Home Economics at the University of Windsor would be phased out. In order to achieve this end in a humane manner, enrolment in the Department was stopped and those already in the program were given

sufficient time to graduate.

The demise of the Home Economics Department at Windsor had little to do with low enrolment figures. Barbara Lanz, an Associate Professor in Home Economics, believes that a number of factors contributed to the disbanding of the Department. Lanz maintains that in terms of faculty replacement, the Department of Home Economics was, in effect, "starved out." [52] Lacking the priority to ensure financial support and the replacement of retiring faculty members, the Department of Home Economics could not sustain itself.

Additionally, Lanz points out that the failure to establish a graduate program in Home Economics at Windsor ultimately left the Department vulnerable to budget constraints. The existence of a graduate degree program might have presented more opportunities for the Department to qualify for government funding and to benefit from its student's research. Had the Department expanded in the late 1960's and 1970's to include a graduate program, Lanz maintains, Home Economics at Windsor would have been "tougher to get rid of." [53] Without a graduate degree program in place, Home Economics at Windsor could not compete with more progressive programs elsewhere. The program had according to Dr. Lois Smedick "ceased to have viability" and its faculty members absorbed into Family Studies and housed in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. [54]

According to Professor Lanz, without a graduate program, the Department of Home Economics at the University of Windsor

remained an anomaly within the University and within the discipline as a whole. The trend in Home Economics Departments at other Canadian universities was to encourage students to enter specific streams of specialization while fostering an industrial and scientific focus. Windsor's Department of Home Economics did not develop this way. While the general approach prepared its graduates for teaching positions primarily at the secondary school level, other employment options for Home Economics graduates could not be afforded the same attention.

Unable to be guaranteed faculty replacements and perceived as a "vulnerable department" in terms of budget cuts, Home Economics at Windsor became "an easy target to be disbanded." [55] The five remaining faculty members, all women, have now either retired, accepted teaching positions on a part-time basis or are currently on retraining leave. Currently, the Home Economics Department and the Home Economics degree have disappeared from the calendar.

The Department's absorption into Family Studies, however, has meant that a number of the original Home Economics courses have been retained. Many of the graduates of the Family Studies program will receive essentially the same employment opportunities as Home Economics graduates did previously. Positions involving teaching, family mediation and social service which had been opened to graduates of Home Economics are presently open to graduate of Family Studies. In light of how little has truly changed in terms of the employment opportunities

of their graduates, Lanz has suggested that perhaps the Department of Home Economics should have changed its name to Family Studies before it was dissolved. [56]

While Professor Lanz believes that the University has been supportive to the Department throughout the disbanding procedure, she points out that the faculty members in Home Economics have had to pay the highest price. Given only three years to carve a niche for themselves in a new Department, those faculty members once teaching in the Home Economics discipline have "had to make more changes that people in other faculties will ever have to make." [57] One must ask, therefore, where will these displaced women faculty members fit in? Perhaps, as Professor Lanz has observed, it is perceived that its is somehow easier for women to make changes in their academic careers than men, even if such changes are not desired. [58]

The perceived vulnerability of the Department of Home Economics has been attributed to a number of factors. These factors, in turn, have implications for other faculties and disciplines in which women dominate or are perceived to be in the majority. The traditionally "female" disciplines, such as teaching, nursing and social work, continue to attract a majority of women. Conversely, traditionally "male" disciplines, including engineering, business administration and science are still predominately male dominated. A significant change in the nature of women's education at the University of Windsor in more recent years, is the large number of women enrolling in the

social sciences (Appendix III). In 1987, not only were more women registered in the social sciences than the arts, but they also outnumbered men. Despite this development, the underrepresentation of women in a significant number of disciplines underscores the continued existence of gender barriers that impede women's access to higher education. While the underrepresentation of women in non-traditional faculties is a significant problem, another dimension of the problem does exist. Lanz maintains that, unfortunately, women who enter non-traditional faculties such as business or engineering are perceived as making "real gains" while those in Home Economics, for example, are censured for contributing to the "status quo." What is missing, however, is a clear understanding of what "traditionally" female disciplines, such as Home Economics, offer in the 1990's. Thus, a re-evaluation of "traditional" women's areas - in work, education and society, is needed in order to correct this view. Lanz points out, for example, that Home Economics, as a source of employment, has real viability in our society.

> Ideas that are now being expounded in the nineties and onward into the next century are dealing with areas of care, service and getting back to the roots of the family...[59]

Although society tends to reserve the greatest praise and pay to traditionally "male" occupations, Lanz points out that traditional "female" occupations, such as teaching, nursing and social work, should not be rejected as worthless. Rather, they should be afforded more power and status in a liberated society.

Thus, amidst the debate that has surrounded the disbanding of the Department of Home Economics at Windsor emerges the central issue of vulnerability of programs that are dominated by women. Barbara Lanz maintains that at the University of Windsor, in particular, the Department of Home Economics has been somehow perceived as having less credibility than other faculties. Although Lanz did not offer an explanation for the existence of this perception, it nevertheless reflects on the reasons for the Department's demise.

The dissatisfaction that was actively voiced among women during the 1970's, continues to be a characteristic of their experience. Despite the findings contained in the 1975 report of the Faculty Association's Committee on the Status of Women Academics that female teaching staff were underrepresented, little improvement had been made a decade later. In 1974, only 10.8 % of the institution's faculty were women. Although the national average had risen to 16.7 % in 1984, female faculty averages at Windsor still lagged behind. In that year, only 14.0 % of the total faculty at the University of Windsor were female. [60] This underrepresentation of women at the faculty level stands in sharp contrast to the changing composition of the female student body. In 1964, 26% of the student population were women. By 1985, however, the percentage of female students had risen to 51%, and in 1987, reached 54.5%. [61] Clearly, as women continue to attend Canadian universities in increasing numbers, women in teaching positions continue to be underrepresented.

In institutions across Canada, women at the faculty level have been underrepresented albeit to a lesser degree. For example, Anne Rochon Ford points out that the Status of Women committee which reported to the Association of Universities and College of Canada detailing the unsatisfactory position of women at the University of Toronto in 1972, was forced to reiterate many of the same complaints over ten years later. [62] The struggle on the part of female faculty members to improve their conditions of employment has been an ongoing proposition. Throughout the 1980's, female faculty members at the University of Windsor attempted to end discriminatory practises which ensure that the ideology of "difference" will continue to inform women's experience.

According to Dr. Pamela Milne of the Religious Studies Department at the University of Windsor, sexism on campus continues to hinder qualified women. Dr. Milne maintains that within the teaching and administrative ranks at Windsor, inequitable employment practices have worked and continue to work to exclude women. Dr. Milne has concluded that

> the most pervasive form of sexism at the University of Windsor is the sexism that keeps women out of the teaching faculty and out of the senior administration. [63]

Milne's reasoning is echoed by John McAuley in his research on women academics. McAuley's study on women's access to promotion and senior management positions concludes that the activities leading to such opportunities for women are "controlled and regulated by male `gatekeepers'." [64] McAuley's comments

underscore the negative aspects of a social hierarchy that does not place equal value on the potential of women and men.

At the level of administration, women have been almost entirely excluded from official policy formation and major decision making offices. That female professors are not given positions or are significantly outnumbered in the majority of departments means that many students never receive a woman's intellectual point of view. Both male and female students are dependent upon almost exclusively male decision makers to determine the future of their careers. In the absence of female role models and mentors, many women may be deterred from pursing an academic career. [65] The underrepresentation of women within the ranks of teachers and administrators thus results in a vicious circle in which "men's definition of the world prevails and remains credited with orthodoxy." [66] Dr. Lois Smedick points out the underrepresentation of women at the faculty level represents a situation that "has become untenable." In the effort to "utilize everyone's potential," the university must "do what it can." [67]

Employment equity at the University of Windsor has proven to be an issue geared specifically at improving women's position at the faculty level. Here, the problem of discrimination was studied and a report was submitted to the Senate in 1988. Entitled "50 / 50 by 2000," the report maintained that the University of Windsor had "one of the worst records in the province of Ontario with respect to hiring women." [68] In 1986,

the University of Windsor hired the fewest number of women faculty among the seventeen Ontario universities. During that year, only 17 % of the faculty positions were held by women. [69] In an effort to improve the situation, Dr. Ronald Ianni, President of the University, instituted a four point positive action plan with respect to employment equity in late 1988. The role of Vice President Gordon Wood, instituting procedures and coordinating the President's Committee in Employment Equity, was instrumental in preparing the groundwork for the plan. [70]

The main features of Dr. Ianni's plan were intended to improve Windsor's record with regard to the employment of women. First, the President required all faculty Deans to devise an agenda "to determine where and when women could be hired." A Presidential Commission was then set up, and given the power to veto any academic appointment made at the institution. Third, an "equity assessor" was assigned to monitor every hiring and to ensure that female candidates were afforded fair consideration. [71] The four point plan resulted in a major improvement in the hiring of female faculty members at the University. In 1989, twenty-two out of thirty-two faculty positions went to women. The results of the plan have been characterized as a definite "breakthrough" for women's representation at the faculty level. [72] A year earlier, only five out of twenty faculty positions went to women. As Dr. Milne has concluded, 1989 represented "the first year in the history of the University that a significant step forward on equity faculty hiring." [73] Professor Emily

Carasco, President of the Faculty Association and a member of the President's Advisory Committee, pointed out that the improved representation of female faculty one year after the implementation of the four point plan indicated that "women are out there, it's just a conscious decision to hire them." [74]

At the level of administration, women at the University of Windsor continue to be severely underrepresented. The past Equity Employment Officer, Dr. Marge Holman, reported that only 7.7 % of senior administrative appointments were held by women from 1986 to 1988. [75] Presently there are two women who have risen to the level of Dean, Dr. Lois Smedick, a professor of English who is Dean of Graduate Studies and Dr. Kate McCrone, a professor of History who is Dean of Social Sciences. Other female Officers of the Administration include Dr. Ann McCabe, Associate Vice-President Academic, Dr. Susan Martin, Director of the School of Dramatic Art, Susan Gold Smith, Director of the School of Visual Arts, and Sheila Cameron, Director of the School of Nursing. [76]

The significant improvements made by female faculty members during 1989 and 1990 are not guaranteed to continue in the future. Presently, Dr. Ianni's four point plan represents only a "quasi-mandatory" policy for equity hiring. Thus, while equity hiring practices are based on the assumption that women are qualified and competent, they must be acknowledged as only partial acceptance. As a "quasi-mandatory" measure, the plan rests largely on the goodwill of those who have the power to

choose candidates and to hire them. The President's veto power over equity positions does offer some control over the process. Women on campus, however, must continue to be aware that "while policies - and even attitudes - concerning women may be quite favourable, subtle behaviour discrimination towards women may abound." [77] Essentially, equity hiring practices at the University of Windsor are still a voluntary measure to address the problem of discrimination.

President Ianni's four point plan has been favourably received at the University of Windsor. The plan has begun to erode the sources of women's implicit segregation on campus. It has produced, for example, the appointment of the first female faculty member in the Faculty of Engineering in the history of the University of Windsor. [78] During the decade of the 1970's and 1980's, women at the University have kept the issues regarding the level of their involvement at the forefront. The actions of the administration in ensuring that faculty women at the University are treated equitably has been of key importance and has resulted in concrete improvement in their participation. But, according to both Pamela Milne and Lois Smedick, it is the collective action of women themselves that must ultimately decide the pace of improvement. [79] To finally overcome the sources of women's "separate and `different' education," it is the "totality of what women do on campus that will make a difference." [80]

In the decade of the 1970's and 1980's, the very meaning of women's "separate and `different' education" had, in effect, come

full circle. The Women's Movement and the second wave of feminism that occurred in the late 1960's and early 1970's, did, however, address the implicit sources of discrimination against women. As women became sensitized to the nature of their experience in various aspects of Canadian society, they began to identify and to denounce gender barriers that hindered their equal participation with men. The Women's Movement encouraged feminists to put forth analytical and critical studies of the sources of discrimination against women. From this increased awareness, practices and attitudes that had represented an implicit source of women's "separateness" at Windsor were brought to the forefront. During the 1970's and 1980's, the sources of women's "separate and `different' education" at the University of Windsor became explicit once more.

Endnotes to Chapter Four

1. The author wishes to point out that the Report of the President which are to issued every year, do not appear for the years 1972-73 - 1983-84, 1986-86 - 1987-88. They are an invaluable source of information and it is regrettable that they were not issued for the ten year period crucial to the current chapter.

2. Mary Kinnear, Daughters of Time: Women in the Western Tradition (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982), p. 174.

3. Nancy Adamson, Linda Briskin, Margaret McPhail, Feminist Organizing for Change: The Contemporary Women's Movement in Canada (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 51.

4. Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970), p. vii.

5. Ibid., p. 154.

6. Nancy Adamson et al., Feminist Organizing for Change, p. 55.

7. Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and Their Segregated Work (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984), p. 140.

8. Kotash, Long Way From Home, pp. 168-170.

9. Ambassador Yearbook, 1973, p. 37.

10. See for example : Report of the President's Committee, The Status of Women at Mount Allison University (New Brunswick: Mount Allison University, 1975); Task Force to the President, The Status of Women at the University of New Brunswick (Winnipeg: University of New Brunswick, 1979); Laurentian University, Report of the Status of Women Committee (Sudbury: Laurentian University, 1975); Special Publication - Second Conference of Women in the University (Kingston, 1973); Anne Innis Dagg and Patricia Thompson, Miseducation : Women and Canadian Universities (Toronto: OISE , 1988).

11. Lynn McDonald and Marcia Smith Lenglet, "The Status of Women at McMaster University," in Women in Canada, ed. Marylee Stephenson (Toronto: Eden Press, 1973), p. 240.

12. Ibid., p. 240.

13. Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam, But Can You Type ? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women (Toronto: Clark Irwin and Company, 1977), p. 9.

14. Ibid., p. 8.

15. Gwendoline Pilkington, "Review of But Can You Type ? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women," Canadian Journal of Higher Education 3, 1,(1978) : 90-92.

16. Ibid., p. 91.

17. Ibid., p. 92.

18. Vickers and Adams, But Can You Type ?, p. 20.

19. Norma V. Bowen, "Women in Ontario Universities," OCUFA Newsletter, Special Issue, 8 (1975) : 1.

20. Chris Woodrow, "History of the University of Windsor - J. Francis Leddy," Windsor University Magazine, 8, 1 (Spring, 1988) : 11.

21. Evelyn Grey McLean, "The Centre for Women's Interests and Concerns," Alumni Times Magazine - The University of Windsor (Spring, 1973) : 16.

22. Ibid., p. 16.

23. Ibid., p. 17.

24. Office of Information Services, Memo 7 January, 1977, p. 2.

25. Neil Guppy, Doug Balson, and Susan Vellutini, "Women in Higher Education," in Women and Education: A Canadian Perspective, p. 177.

26. Office of Information Services, Memo 1 May, 1975, p. 5.

27. Kathleen McCrone, "Women in Ontario Universities," OCUFA Newsletter Special Issue, 8 (1975) : 2.

28. Ibid., p. 2.

29. Ibid., p. 2.

30. Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada, Status of Women in Canadian Universities (Ottawa, 1975), p. 21.

31. Ibid., p. 21-25.

32. Ford, A Path Not Strewn With Roses, pp. 76-77.

33. Ibid., p. 77.

34. Kathleen McCrone, "A Certificate in Women's Studies," Windsor University Magazine 7,1,(Spring-Summer, 1986) : 10.

35. Ibid., p. 10.

36. Ibid., p. 10.

37. McCrone, " A Certificate in Women's Studies," p. 9.

38. The Lance (University of Windsor) 14 November, 1975, p. 7.

39. Ibid., p. 7.

40. Ibid., p. 10.

41. Ibid., 17 October, 1975, p. 3.

42. Ibid., 7 November, 1975, p. 13.

43. Report of the President, 1971 - 1972, p. 156 - 157.

44. Ibid., 31 October, 1975, p. 6.

45. Ibid., 16 March, 1979, p. 5.

46. Ibid., 16 September, 1977, p. 5.

47. Ibid., 23 September, 1977, p. 1.

48. Ibid., 25 November, 1977, p. 2.

49. Ibid., 7 February, 1985, p. 9.

50. Ibid., 12 February, 1985, p. 6.

51. Ibid., 12 February, 1985, p. 6.

52. Barbara Lanz, Department of Home Economics, University of Windsor, interview held 4 October 1990 at the University of Windsor. Referred to subsequently as Interview D.

53. Ibid.

54. Interview A

55. Interview D.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

59. Ibid.

60. Pamela Milne, "Employment Equity at the University of Windsor," From taped seminar entitled "Sexism on Campus - Is it a Problem? ", University of Windsor, April 4, 1990. Referred to subsequently as Interview C (taped seminar). Dr. Milne cites statistical information compiled by Dr. Marge Holman, Employment Equity Officer, University of Windsor, 1987.

61. Ibid.

62. Ford, A Path Not Strewn with Roses, pp. 60-61.

63. Milne, Interview C (taped seminar).

64. John McAuley, "Women Academics : A Case Study in Inequality," in In a Man's World: Essays on Women in Male-Dominated Professions, eds. Anne Spencer and David Podmore (London: Tavistock Publications, 1987), pp. 158.

65. Pamela Milne, Religious Studies Department, University of Windsor, interview held 9 May 1990 at the University of Windsor. Referred to subsequently as Interview B.

66. Jane L. Thompson, Learning Liberation, p. 36.

67. Interview A.

68. David Morelli, "Equity at U of W - Blip or Breakthrough ?," The Saturday Windsor Star, March 3, 1990, p. E 1.

69. Ibid., p. E 1.

70. Interview A.

71. David Morelli, "Equity at U of W," The Saturday Windsor Star p. E 1.

72. Interview A, B.

73. Interview C (taped seminar).

74. David Morelli, "Equity at U of W," The Saturday Windsor Star p. E 1.

75. Interview C (taped seminar).

76. University of Windsor, Undergraduate Calendar, 1990-1992, pp. 14-16.

77. Bernice Sandler and Roberta Hall, The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators and Graduate Studies (Washington: Project on the Status of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1986), p. 2.

78. Interview A.

79. Interview A,B.

80. Interview A.

Conclusion

Women's experience at the University of Windsor, from the beginnings of St. Mary's Academy through to the present, has been influenced by an ideology of "separateness" or "difference". This ideology was not limited to the university setting but rather reflected society's perception of women's proper sphere. As society's attitudes towards women changed, so too did the sources, consequences and the perceived appropriateness of their characterization as "other" on campus. In terms of the history of women at the University of Windsor, the very meaning of "difference" changed and modified as it became an increasingly unacceptable and untenable response to women's educational needs.

From approximately 1850 to 1950, the nature of women's education at St. Mary's Academy and Holy Names College presented the most explicit manifestations of the ideology of "difference". It was, nevertheless, an accurate reflection of society's perception of the proper role of women. Women and men occupied strictly separate and different spheres of activity and this was, in turn, learned and reinforced in the classroom. The Catholic nature of the institutions contributed significantly to the separation of the sexes, both physically and academically, and added theological credence to women's "divinely ordained" role as the moral and spiritual protector of the family. Every aspect of

their education worked to enhance this role.

Gender assumptions had a significant influence on what career choices women made and on what society determined was acceptable for them to pursue. Students at St. Mary's and Holy Names were trained for occupations that represented extensions of the domestic sphere, such as service, nurturing or care-giver positions. These positions were often considered a prelude to, or a poor substitute for, marriage and child-rearing. Trained to be the "angels of goodness", women did not consider entering the public world for the purpose of competing with men for positions of power and authority.

When Assumption College for men became a coeducational facility in 1950, the explicit manifestations of the ideology of "separateness" became increasingly implicit. Women and men were no longer physically separated to the extent that had existed previously. Students of both sexes sat together in the classroom and engaged in the life of the institution. Coeducation did not, however, come to mean an equality of educational experience.

Thus, during the first decade of coeducation, the sources of women's "separateness" on campus manifested themselves in different, but no less powerful ways. In the attitudes expressed towards their presence, for example, women were often perceived as an amusing anomaly on campus. They did not occupy powerful positions in the administration or on faculty, nor did they have a significant role in student government. Instead, they set up their own organizations apart from their male colleagues. These

organizations, such as the Holy Names Undergraduate Association, often assumed a secondary position on campus and became the social complement to the political activities of men.

The democratic pretences of the "student power" movements of the 1960s seemed to reaffirm a faith in the merits of equality of opportunity in the university setting. Despite this, the attempt to include student voices in administrative decision-making at Windsor failed to include specific improvements for women. The sources of women's implicit segregation, and the systemic gender barriers that resulted, went unchallenged. After a decade of coeducation, women continued to cluster in non-professional disciplines and were seriously underrepresented in Ph.D and Masters programs. The campus activities in which women engaged appeared outdated and irrelevant and were censored for existing outside the mainstream of other political organizations. In terms of their educational needs and concerns, women were increasingly pushed to the margins of the institution. With the onslaught of the Women's Liberation Movement of the 1970's, however, the ideology of "difference" was confronted head on. Feminists produced studies of the sources of women's "separateness" in a variety of contexts and called for the dismantling of implicit gender barriers to their equality with men. The notion of "separate spheres" became increasingly untenable as women from diverse social and ethnic backgrounds joined together in the denunciation of their exclusion from positions of authority and power. At the University of Windsor, women demanded equal access

to administrative and faculty positions and rejected discriminatory practises that limited their bid for employment equity. Women in the student body ensured that their voices were heard through the dissemination of feminist ideas and the organization of feminist clubs and caucuses. Through these efforts, the implicit sources of women's separation were identified, brought to the forefront and rendered explicit once more.

The ideology of "difference" that influenced the nature of women's experience at the University of Windsor took on a variety of meanings and manifestations. Intimately linked to society's attitudes towards women, the ideology proved to be a pliable and enduring construct that, nonetheless, was often out of step with the reality of women's lives. The initial separation of women and men at Windsor slowly became implicitly entrenched in the very structure of the institution. As society's attitudes towards women changed and as women's expectations changed, however, so too did the meaning of their "separate and `different' education". No longer accepted as appropriate nor desirable, the ideology of "difference" has instead been confronted. Choosing to reject the remnants of their "separate and `different' education", women at the University of Windsor now work to dismantle barriers to their full participation as equal members of the institution.

Selected Bibliography

I. Primary Sources

Assumption Archives, University of Windsor

RG 1 Box 5 File 4 - Bishop John Kidd to Reverend T. MacDonald. 7 October 1938.

RG 1 Box 5 File 4 - Bishop John Kidd to Reverend T. MacDonald. 22 November 1938.

University of Windsor - Published Reports

Brefka, Linda; Rousseau, Suzanne; Doreen Bauld. Home Economics at the University of Windsor. Pamphlet prepared by the Home Economics Department, University of Windsor, 1987.

Office of Information Services, Memo. University of Windsor, December 1968, March 1969, January 1977, May 1975.

Report of the President. Assumption University, 1954 - 1964.

Report of the President . University of Windsor, 1964 - 1971, 1974 - 1982.

Undergraduate Calender. University of Windsor, 1990 -1992.

Yearbooks

Assumption College. Ambassador Yearbook, 1939 - 1953.

Assumption University. Ambassador Yearbook, 1953 - 1964.

University of Windsor. Ambassador Yearbook, 1964 - 1973.

Holy Names College Brochure, 1934.

Interviews and Taped Seminars - Held at Leddy Library

Lanz, Barbara. Department of Home Economics, University of Windsor,Interview D, 4 October, 1990.

Milne, Pamela. Religious Studies Department, University of Windsor,Interview A, 9 May 1990.

Smedick, Lois. Department of Graduate Studies, University of Windsor, Interview B, 9 May 1990.

University of Windsor. "Sexism on Campus - Is it a Problem ?". Interview C (taped seminar). 4 April 1990.

Newspapers

The Lance (University of Windsor). 14 November 1975 - 12 February 1985.

Windsor Daily Star. 20 May 1946.

II. Secondary Sources - Books

Acton, Janice; Goldsmith, Penny; and Shepard, Bonnie. eds. Women at Work - Ontario, 1850 - 1930. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1974.

Adamson, Nancy; Briskin, Linda; and McPhail, Margaret. Feminist Organizing for Change: The Contemporary Women's Movement in Canada. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Adelman, Howard. The Holiversity: A Perspective on the Wright Report. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Anderson, Bonnie S., and Zinner, Judith P. A History of Their Own: Women in the Europe from Prehistory to the Present. Volume 1. New York: Harper and Row, 1988.

Axelrod, Paul. Scholars and Dollars : Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945 - 1980. Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1983.

Axelrod, Paul and Reid, John G., eds. Youth, University and Canadian Society: Essays in the Social History of Higher Education. Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1983.

Bannerman, Norma. ed. What's Past is Prologue - A History of Home Economics in Alberta. Calgary: Alberta Home Economics Association, 1981.

Bannerman, Norma; Rebus, Shirley; and Smith, Arlene., eds. We Are Tommorrow's Past: History of the Home Economics Association. Ottawa: Canadian Home Economics Association, 1989.

Batte, Helen [Sister John Thomas]. Rooted in Hope: A History of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary of the Ontario Province. Windsor: Paulist Press, 1983.

Bercuson, David; Bothwell, Robert; and Granastein, J.L. The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984.

Berger, Carl. The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English - Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Carpenter, Helen M. A Divine Discontent: Edith Kathleen Russell, Reforming Educator. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Cockburn, Patricia and Raymond, Yvonne. Women University Graduates in Continuing Education and Employment. Toronto: Canadian Federation of University Women, 1966.

Dagg, Anne Innis and Thompson, Patricia J. Miseducation: Women and Canadian Universities. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1988.

Daly, Mary. The Church and the Second Sex. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Danylewycz, Marta. Taking the Veil: An Alternative to Marriage, Motherhood and Spinsterhood in Quebec, 1840 - 1920. Montreal: McClelland and Stewart, 1987.

Dudovitz, Resa., ed. Women in Academe. New York: Pergamon Press, 1984.

Francis, Douglas R.; Jones, Richard; and Smith, Donald B., eds. Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Limited, 1988.

Furniss, Todd W., and Graham, Patricia. Women in Higher Education. Washington: Harper and Row, 1974.

Gaskell, Jane, and McLaren, Arlene., eds. Women and Education: A Canadian Perspective. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1987.

Gillett, Margaret. We Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill. Montreal: Eden Press, 1981.

Grant, Douglas., ed. The University and Business. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Greenglass, Esther R. A World of Difference: Gender Roles in Perspective. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Hartman, Mary S., and Banner, Lois., eds. Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives in the History of Women. New York: Octagon Books, 1976.

Houston, Susan E., and Prentice, Alison. Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth - Century Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Howe, Florence. Myths of Coeducation: Selected Essays, 1964 - 1983. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Jones, D. C., ed. Monograms in Education. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1981.

Kealy, Linda., ed. A Not Unreasonable Claim : Women and Reform in Canada. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1987.

Kelly, Mary., ed. Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History. Boston: G.K. Hall and Company, 1979.

Kinnear, Mary. Daughters of Time: Women in The Western Tradition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.

Kostash, Myrna. Long Way From Home: The Story of The Sixties Generation in Canada. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1980.

Kraditor, Aileen S., ed. Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Lander, Louise. Images of Bleeding: Menstruation as Ideology. New York: Orlando Press, 1988.

Lasser, Carol. ed. Educating Men and Women Together: Coeducation in a Changing World. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Levitt, Cyril. Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties : A Study of Student Movements in Canada, the United States and Germany. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

L'Esperance, Jeanne. The Widening Sphere: Women in Canada, 1870 - 1949. Toronto: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1982.

Montreuil, E. M.; Schell, Helen; and Sadler, Ralph K. Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of St. Mary's Academy, College of the Holy Names. Detroit: Sisters of the Holy Names, 1915.

Neilson, William and Gaffield, Chad., eds. Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty - First Century. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1986.

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. The Scope and Nature of University Education. New York: Algin Press, 1958.

Prentice, Alison. The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid - Nineteenth Century Upper Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

---------- ; Brown, Paula; Cuthbert, Gail; Light, Beth; Mitchison, Wendy; and Black, Naomi. Canadian Women: A History. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988.

---------- and Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann., eds. The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History. Volume 2. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

Power, Michael. compiler. Assumption College: Years of Uncertainty, 1855 - 1870. Volume 1. Windsor: Assumption University, 1987.

----------. compiler. Assumption College: The O'Connor Years, 1870 - 1890. Volume 2. Windsor: Assumption University, 1986.

----------. compiler. Assumption College: The Making of A Modern School, 1890 - 1919. Volume 3. Windsor: Assumption University, 1989.

Richardson, Betty. Sexism in Higher Education. New York: The Seabury Press, 1974.

Roach, Al. All Our Memories: Being A Fond Look Back At Our Yesteryears Along this Detroit River Border. Windsor: Essex Historical Association, 1980.

Rochon, Anne Ford. A Path Not Strewn With Roses: 100 Years of Women at the University of Toronto, 1884 - 1984. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Roche, George. The Balancing Act: Quota Hiring in Higher Education. Illinois: Open Court Publishers, 1974.

Rosenburg, Charles E. The Care of Strangers: The Rise of America's Hospital System. New York: Basic Books Incorporated Publications, 1987.

Rossi, Alice S. and Calderwood, Ann. eds. Academic Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power. New York: Paulist Press, 1972.

Sandler, Bernice and Hall, Roberta. The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students. Washington: Project on the Status and Education of Women, 1986.

Scott, Joan; Conway, Jill K.; and Bourque, Susan C. Learning About Women: Gender, Politics and Power. Anne Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987.

Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus And Mary. Saint Mary's Academy, 1864 - 1977: Memoirs. Windsor: Sisters of the Holy Names, 1978.

Spencer, Anne and Podmore, David., eds. In a Man's World: Essays on Women in Male - Dominated Professions. London: Tavistock Publications, 1987.

Spencer, Stacy; Harrington, Susanmarie; Hufter, Lynne;and Hutchinson, Catherine. eds. New Occasional Papers in Women's Studies. Michigan: University of Michigan, 1987.

Solomon, Barbara Miller. In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Stephenson, Marylee., ed. Women in Canada. Toronto: Eden Press, 1973.

Stewart, Lee Jean. Its Up to You: Women at the University of British Columbia in the Early Years. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1990.

Stimpson, Catherine., ed. Women, History and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Strong - Boag, Veronica. The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in Canada, 1919 - 1939. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1988.

Szafran, Robert F. Universities and Women Faculty: Why Some Organizations Discriminate More Than Others. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984.

Theodore, Athena. The Campus Troublemakers: Academic Women in Protest. Houston: Cap and Gown Press, 1986.

Thompson, Jane L. Learning Liberation: Women's Response to Men's Education. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

University Women's Club Of Toronto. 75 Years in Retrospect: University of Women's Club of Toronto, 1902 - 1978. Toronto: The Hunter Rose Company, 1978.

Vickers, Jill McCalla and Adam, June. But Can You Type ? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women. Toronto: Clark Irwin, 1977.

Wilson, Donald J. ed. An Imperfect Past : Education and Society in Canadian History. Toronto: Clark Irwin, 1977.

York University Status of Women. Equity For Women: The First Decade. Toronto: York University, 1985.

III. Articles

Axelrod, Paul. "Historical Writing and Canadian Universities: The State of the Art." Queen's Quarterly 89, 1 (Spring 1982) : 128 - 139.

Bowen, Norma V. "Women in Ontario Universities." OCUFA Newsletter Special Issue , 8 (1975) : 1.

Briskin, Linda. "Under-representation of women, anti-feminism and affirmative action." OCUFA Forum 6,21 (April 1990) : 3.

Brown, Victoria Bissell. "The Fear of Feminization: Los Angeles High Schools in the Progressive Era." Feminist Studies 16,3 (Fall 1990) 493 - 518.

Burstyn, Joan. "Religious Arguments Against Higher Education for Women in England, 1840 - 1890." Women's Studies 1,1 (1972) : 111 - 131.

Dagg, Anne Innis. "The Status of Some Canadian Women Ph.D Scientists." Atlantis 11,1 (Fall 1985) : 30 - 45.

Fidelis [Agnes Machar]. "Higher Education for Women." Canadian Monthly 7 (January 1875) : 150 - 160.

Fingard, Judith. "Gender and Inequality At Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950." Dalhousie Review 64,4,(Winter 1984 - 1985): 687 - 703.

Flax, Jane. "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory." Signs 12 (1987) : 621 - 643.

Gaffield, Chad. "Back to School: Towards a New Agenda for the History of Education." Acadiensis XV, 2 (Spring 1986) : 169 - 191.

Gillett, Margaret. "The Seahorse Society." McGill Journal of Education X, 1 (Spring 1975) : 40 - 48.

Gillett, Margaret. "Sexism in Higher Education." Atlantis 1,1 (Fall 1975) : 72 - 84.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg. "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education." Signs 3,4 (Summer 1978) : 759 - 773.

Kerber, Linda K. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." Journal of American History (June 1988) : 9 - 39.

Kilson, Marion. "The Status of Women in Higher Education." Signs 1,4 (Summer 1976) : 935 - 942.

Lindsay, J. A. "Sex in Education." The Dalhousie Review X,2 (July 1930) : 147 - 159.

McCrone, Kathleen. "A Certificate in Women's Studies." Windsor University Magazine 7,1 (Spring - Summer 1986) : 10.

----------. "Women in Ontario Universities." OCUFA Newsletter Special Issue, 8 (1975) : 2.

McLean, Evelyn Grey. "The Centre for Women's Interests and Concerns." Alumni Times Magazine - The University of Windsor (Spring 1973) : 5 - 8.

Pilkington, Gwendoline. Review of But Can You Type ? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women by Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adams. Canadian Journal of Higher Education 3,1 (1978) : 90 - 92.

Quennell, Mary Lou. "Women M.B.A's: Coming of Age in the 1980's." Windsor University Magazine 1,2 (Winter 1980) : 30 - 32.

Reid, John G. "The Education of Women at Mount Allison, 1854 - 1914." Acadiensis XII,2 (Spring 1987) : 6 - 24.

Report of The Principal's Advisory Review Committee on the Status of Women at Queen's. "The Status of Women at Queen's, 1979." Queen's Quarterly XII, 10 (March 1980) : 1 - 18.

Scott, Joan. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." American Historical Review 91, 5 (December 1986) : 1053 - 1075.

Stamp, Robert M. "Teaching Girls Their `God-Given Place in Life': The Introduction of Home Economics in the School." Part 1 Atlantis 2,2 (Spring 1977) : 65 - 77.

University Affairs (April 1990). "National study on women and engineering launched." : 7 - 8.

---------- (April 1990). "In engineering and applied science, only one in eight is female." : 12 - 13.

Windsor Alumni Times (Fall 1959) "Holy Names College - From Cottage to College." : 14 - 17.

IV. Unpublished Papers and Theses

Backhouse, Constance B. "Women Faculty at UWO: Reflections on the Employment Equity Award." University of Western Ontario (April 1988) : 1 - 60 (Mimeographed).

Frazier De Pencier, Marni. "Ideas of the English - Speaking Universities in Canada to 1920." Ph.D dissertation. University of Toronto, 1978.

Kiefer, Nancy. "The Impact of the Second World War on Female Students at the University of Toronto, 1939 - 1949." Master's Thesis, University of Toronto, 1984.

Lapierre, Paula J. S. "Separate or Mixed ?: The Debate Over Co-education at McGill." Master's Thesis, McGill University, 1983.

Neatby, Nicole. "Women at Queen's in the 1920's: A Separate Sphere." Master's Thesis, Queen's University, 1987.

Temple, Anna. "The Development of Higher Education for Women in Ontario, 1867 - 1919." Ph.D dissertation, Wayne State University, 1981.

Thompson, Nancy Ramsay. "The Controversy Over the Admission of Women to University College, University of Toronto." Master's Thesis, University of Toronto, 1974.

Stewart, Lee J. "The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia, 1906 - 1956." Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1987.

V. Reports - Published

Association of Women in Canadian Universities. Status of Women in Canadian Universities. Ottawa, 1975.

Committee of the Presidents of the Universities of Ontario. From the 1960's to the 1970's: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario. Toronto, 1966.

Equal Rights Review and Coordinating Committee. Report to the Senate, McMaster University. Hamilton, 1976.

Report of the President's Committee on the Status of Women Chairpersons. By Milnor Alexander and A. J. Ayre, Chairpersons. Regina: University of Regina, 1975.

Report of the President's Task Force on the Status of Women at the University of Guelph. Status of Women at the University of Guelph. Guelph: University of Guelph, 1975.

Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.

Report of the Status of Women Committee. Sudbury: Laurentian University, 1979.

Report of the Work of the Women's Advisors. Sudbury: Laurentian University, 1979.

Report of a Commission of Inquiry on Forty Catholic - Church Related Colleges and Universities. A Commitment to Higher Education in Canada. Windsor: University of Windsor, 1970.

Report of the President's Committee on the Status of Women at Mount Allison University. New Brunswick: Mount Allison University, 1975.

Second National Conference on Women in the University. Special Publication. Kingston: Queen's University Press, 1973.

Status of Women Committee at the University of Winnipeg. Report to the Board of Regents. Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg, 1975.

Task Force on the Status of Women at York University. Report to the Senate. Toronto: York University, 1975.

Task Force to the President. The Status of Women at the University of New Brunswick. Moncton: New Brunswick, 1979.

V. Newspapers

"Employment Equity at the University of Windsor - Blip or Breakthrough ?." The Saturday Windsor Star, 3 March 1990, sec. 4, p. E1.

APPENDIX I

Number of Female Students Registered
in Graduate Studies at the
University of Windsor
1964-65 - 1968-69

Year	Number of Men	Number of Women	Women as a Percentage of Total
1964-65	54	8	13
1965-66	63	12	16
1966-67	73	14	16
1967-68	98	14	12.5
1968-69	110	19	14.7

SOURCE : Windsor. University. Report of the President, 1964-65 - 1968-69.

APPENDIX II

Postgraduate Degree by Sex

	Masters			Doctorate		
Year	Total	Female	%Female	Total	Female	%Female
1970-71	9,609	2,115	22.4	1,625	151	9.3
1975-76	11,555	3,525	30.5	1,693	318	18.8
1980-81	12,432	4,654	37.4	1,738	399	23.0
1981-82	12,903	5,055	39.2	1,816	439	24.2
1982-83	13,110	5,307	40.5	1,715	425	24.8
1983-84	13,925	5,684	40.8	1,821	451	24.8
1984-85	14,572	5,934	40.7	1,878	510	27.2
% Change	51.6	180.4		15.6	238.8	

SOURCE : Statistics Canada, Educational Statistics in the Seventies Cat. # 81-569. Statistics Canada, Education in Canada, Cat. # 81-229 as quoted in Neil Guppy, Doug Balson, and Susan Vellutini, "Women and Higher Education in Canadian Society," in Women and Education - A Canadian Perspective, eds. Jane Gaskell and Arlene McLaren (Calgary : Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1987), p. 177.

APPENDIX III

Summary of Registration, University of Windsor
Fall 1987

Full-time	Men	Women	Total
Arts	401	730	1131
Dramatic Arts	32	37	69
Visual Arts	59	59	118
Music	16	10	26
Musical Arts	16	22	38
Music Theatre	7	8	15
Social Science	1451	1546	2997
Public Administration	32	27	59
Social Work	35	251	286
Science	438	266	704
Computer Science	115	11	126
Nursing	14	313	327
Business Administration	1010	507	1517
Education	165	305	470
Engineering	375	28	403
Human Kinetics	185	135	320
Law	216	179	395
Graduate studies	411	235	646
Full-time Total	4978	4669	9647
Part-time Undergraduates	1427	3206	4623
Part-time Graduates	255	129	404

SOURCE : Windsor. University. University of Windsor Undergraduate Calender, 1990-1992 p. 407.